A

Mr. *HOWEL's*

VIEW

OF THE

Pontificate.

BOOKS Printed for Edward Nutt, *at the* Middle-Temple-Gate *in* Fleet-ſtreet.



Juſt Publiſhed,

A Compleat Hiſtory of the Holy Bible, contain'd in the Old and New-Teſtament: In which are inſerted the Occurrences that happen'd during the Space of about Four hundred Years, from the Days of the Prophet *Malachi* to the Birth of our Bleſſed Saviour, and that have been omitted in all or moſt of the former Works of this Nature. The Whole illuſtrated with Notes, explaining ſeveral difficult Texts, and reconciling many ſeeming Contradictions in the Tranſlations, as well Engliſh as others, of the Sacred Scriptures. Adorn'd with above 150 Cuts, engraven by *J. Sturt*. In three Volumes, 8vo. By *Laurence Howel*, A. M. The Second Edition.

The Orthodox Communicant: By way of Meditation on the Order for the Adminiſtration of the Lord's-Supper, or Holy Communion, according to the Liturgy of the Church of *England*. The Second Edition. By *Laurence Howel*, M. A. (Fit to bind with the Common-Prayer in 8vo. or 12s. with or without Cuts.)

The *Britiſh Parnaſſus*: Or, A Compleat Common-Place-Book of Engliſh Poetry. Containing the moſt genuine, inſtructive, diverting and ſublime Thoughts, *viz.* Allegories, Compariſons, Similitudes, Aphoriſms moral and political, Characters and Deſcriptions of Perſons, Paſſions, Places and Things, that are in the Works of our moſt celebrated Poets. Alphabetically digeſted, and brought down to this preſent Time. To which is prefix'd, A Dictionary of Rhymes, more copious than any hitherto extant. In two Volumes, 12s. By *EDWARD BYSSHE*, Gent.

A

VIEW

OF THE

Pontificate:

From its Supposed BEGINNING,

To the END of

The Council of TRENT,

A. D. 1563.

IN WHICH

The Corruptions of the Scriptures and Sacred Antiquity, Forgeries in the Councils, and Incroachments of the Court of ROME on the Church and State, to support their Infallibility, Supremacy, and other Modern Doctrines, are set in a true Light.

By *LAURENCE HOWEL*, A. M.

The SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:
Printed for *Edward Nutt*, at the *Middle-Temple-Gate* in *Fleetstreet*. MDCCXVI.

Price Six Shillings.

BRITISH MUSEUM

DEO Opt. Max.

ET

SS. Matri Eccleſiæ,

Omni Supplex Humilitate,

D. D.

L. H.

BRITISH MUSEUM

THE PREFACE.

I *Can not addreſs the Reader with any Thing more ſuitable to the Occaſion of theſe Sheets, than the Motto with which the Pious and Learned Doctor* James *concludes his Preface,* Verum amo, & Verum volo mihi dici. *Truth is the great End which all our honeſt Endeavours ought to aim at; and, if in the Purſuit of it we are ſincere, we can not fail of acquiring a right Knowledge of it. Truth never ſhuns the Light, but will bear the niceſt Scrutiny; needs no ſpurious Tracts and forg'd Legends to enforce it, and deſpiſes thoſe mean Arts of corrupting Words, and diſtorting the Senſe of genuine Authorities to ſupport Innovations: Which have been the Occaſion of thoſe wild Mazes of intricate and perplex'd Controverſies, wherewith the Schoolmen, and the more modern Champions of the Pontificate, have defended many erroneous Doctrines and Practices of the* Church *of* Rome; *in ſome Things obſcuring, and in others totally obliterating Truth; and which, if carefully inquired into, muſt undoubtedly very much add to the Confuſion her Proſelytes labour under; who, if they exerciſe their Reaſon, muſt renounce their Religion. This, as the excellent Author of the* Whole Duty of Man *uſefully obſerves, makes out the happy Diſparity be-*

tween

tween the Church of Rome *and Us: For, among the many remarkable Impreſſes of Truth our* Church *bears, it is one, That ſhe does not blindfold her Proſelytes, but leaves them the Uſe of their Faculties; and does not, by obtruding on them an Implicit Belief, force them to lay down their Reaſon when they take up their Faith. For evident Proof of this, I refer the Reader to the following Sheets.*

Of all Things in the World, Religion is of the higheſt Conſequence; not only our preſent, but future Well-being depending thereon; and therefore, in Matters relating to it, we ought to have the neareſt Concern: For the Truth of which, we can appeal no whither ſo ſafely as to the Genuine Holy Scriptures, and uncorrupted Antiquity. And yet both of theſe, in the ſeveral Popiſh Editions, are ſo ſtuffed with Variations, Contradictions, Forgeries, &c. *that it is impoſſible to come at the Truth by them. As to the Variety and Contrariety of the Popiſh Bibles, Doctor* James *hath ſufficiently expoſed them in his* Corruption of the Holy Scriptures, &c. *And as to the* Forgeries in the Councils, *Doctor* Comber *hath exceeded all that went before him, very plainly and methodically taking Notice of the moſt remarkable Occurrences to the Middle of the* Sixth Century: *A Period of Time memorable for the moſt important Tranſactions in the Church. This excellent Method of* Dr. Comber's, *and the late Opportunity I had of converſing with the Councils, in compoſing my* Synopſis *of the* Canons *of the* Greek *and* Latin Churches, *were the Motives that induced me to this Undertaking, which I have carried on to the End of the Council of* Trent; *to which Time I have remarked*

marked the most notorious Abuses the Church suffered from the several Bishops *of* Rome, *who sacrificed all that lay in their Way to serve the Ends of their aspiring Ambition, and lay the Foundation of their future Grandeur.*

Certainly, nothing has so much contributed to the Disrespect of the Christian Religion *in General, as the prostituting it to vile secular Purposes; which having once gain'd Footing in the Church, made Way for many Superstitions to creep into her Worship. These were attended with many and dangerous Consequences; for when the Friends of the* Pontificate *had by a vast Train of forg'd* Decretal Epistles, Sham-Councils, *and base* Corruptions *of the* Holy Scriptures, *and the most early Writers, secur'd, and (as they thought) lodg'd the* Supremacy *in the* Bishop *of* Rome, *they cast about how to invest him with Temporal Power. This they were not long in doing; for when they had, in Matters of* Faith *and* Divine Worship, *persuaded, or rather aw'd, all within their Power into their Opinion, they had nothing to do but to triumph over that Part of Mankind, whose Reason they had crippled and enslaved.*

School-Divinity *(next to Force) contributed very much to this Change of* Religion *in the Minds of Men; and being more amusing than instructing, it's very much to be fear'd, has furnish'd our modern* Enthusiasts *with their whimsical and dangerous Notions of* God *and his true* Religion. *And if we examine more strictly into the Practices of several Popes in relation to Church-Discipline, we shall find, that by their unlawfully commissioning the Laity to exercise the* Sacerdotal Office, *as in the Case of*

Baptism,

Baptism, they were the Source from whence our Sectaries *drew their Principles.*

By whom was Rebellion more enforc'd than by such eminent Exemplars of it as the Popes, who with an arm'd Force have often confronted their Sovereigns? Whence the Deposing-Doctrine, *(too much since imitated) but from the impious Example of Popes, who have dethron'd Kings, and proudly trod upon the Necks of Emperors? Whence that juggling Distinction of the* * Double Capacity *of Princes, so destructive to Crown'd Heads, but from the Champions of the* Pontificate? *Whence so many false Notions of the Deity and its Worship, but from their fabulous Narratives and ridiculous Forgeries? And whence those distorted Interpretations of Sacred Writ, but from their disingenuous Glosses and Prostitution of it to base Ends? In short, it has been their Business to sow Dissention in all Parts of the Christian World, where they had not immediate Power, that by their fatal Divisions they might more easily devour; engaging Kings in their Quarrel against their Subjects, and supporting Children and Subjects in most unnatural Rebellions against their Parents and Sovereigns. By these Means the Wicked have been encouraged to go on in their Ways, and the Minds of honest well-meaning Men too often been debauched and ensnared, under Pretence of promoting the Service of God and their Prince, to despise both.*

* p. 282.

28 SE60

THE

THE HISTORY OF THE Pontificate.

IT would be difficult to resolve, whether the Church of Christ hath suffered more by the Barbarity of Heathens, or by the unfaithful Editions of the Councils, and their more unfair Commentaries. For wherever Paganism raged, there the Word of God flourish'd with the Increase of fresh Confessors; and the more the Earth was inrich'd with the Blood of Martyrs, the more the Faith of Christ grew and improv'd, thriving under Persecution, and triumphing in Death.

Nor did the Ignorance of the ancient Monks add more to the Darkness of those Times than the studied Corruptions and vile Contaminations of the best Authors have in later Days: For what they through Carelessness and want of Skill neglected and overlook'd, these most industriously have adulterated, and by repeated Fictions and Impositions frequently suppress'd, and too often stifled Truth. And to support their tottering Supremacy,

and imaginary Infallibility, they will blacken the brighteſt Truths, nay, will not ſtick to prophane the very Sacred Scripture it ſelf with partial and ſubtile Interpretations.

A manifeſt Inſtance of this we have in a Book entituled, *Liber Pontificalis*, which treats of the Lives of the Prelates of *Rome*, and is ſuppoſed by ſome to have been written by Pope *Damaſus*; tho' the Annotator will not allow it to be Pope *Damaſus*'s, but patch'd up out of two ſeveral Authors. *Labb. p.* 63. *Bin. p.* 19. *col.* 2. What Repute a Book deſerves from Strangers, whoſe Authority is queſtioned by its own Aſſerters, let any one judge. Yet this Book, infamous as it is, paſſes with the Papiſts for genuine, who in their Annotations give it the Character of a true and undoubted Hiſtory. This is the Spring from whence have flow'd thoſe numerous adulterate Epiſtles, ſpurious Decrees, and ridiculous Fables, and from whence almoſt all the Divines of that Church have endeavoured to prove their late Doctrines and Practices deſcended from the Infancy of Chriſtianity to theſe very Days in a clear and uninterrupted Succeſſion, and were the Belief and Practice of the earlieſt Fathers of the Church.

And although it is apparently true that this ſame *Liber Pontificalis* is for the moſt Part a Heap of Fictions, firſt of all giving an Account only of the Names and Years of the Popes, and then, out of that infamous *Iſidor Mercator*, ſtuffed with Decretal Epiſtles and other *Romiſh* Additions, agreeable neither to the Ages nor Men of whom they treat. And though it is unqueſtionably true, that theſe *Decretal Epiſtles* were forg'd for no other End than to make the World believe, not only that the Biſhops of *Rome* in all Ages made the greateſt Figure in the Church, but that their very Presbyters bore the

the Pre-eminence over all others. Yet this very Heap of Contradictions have the Editors not only palm'd upon the World for genuine Truths, but out of these very Forgeries, on their Festivals, they appoint the Lessons in their Breviary and Missal, which are read in their Churches in Time of Divine Service for authentick Holy-Scripture.

Binius indeed does sometimes omit Part of this Book in his Notes; but then it is such as no Way relates either to the Doctrine or Discipline of the Church of *Rome:* For whatever he meets with advantageous to it, tho' the grossest Fiction, he most affectionately espouses, and from thence with the most zealous Bigotry endeavours to defend their upstart Faith and new-fashioned Principles.

But since *Baronius* and other Church-Historians found their vain Conjectures upon these Lives of the Popes, it will be necessary to examine the Errors they have led many into. We will begin at St. *Peter*;

Who, although he is sufficiently proved by *Ignatius, Dionysius Corinthius, Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, &c.* to have been some Time at *Rome,* (See Bishop *Pearson's Dissert.* 1. *c.* 7. *p.* 32.) yet they who affirm that this Apostle, whilst he lived, named three Bishops his Successors, *viz. Linus, Cletus* and *Clement,* must excuse my Belief, as much as in that Story of his being buryed in Three several Places, *viz.* in the Temple of *Apollo,* near the *Aurelian* Way; by *Nero's* Palace in the Vatican Mount, and in the triumphal Territory. *Crab. T.* 1. *p.* 30. But the aforesaid Bishop *Pearson,* in *Dissert.* 2. *c.* 1, and 2. hath made this clear from S. *Irenæus,* who saith, *That the Blessed Apostles laying the Foundation of the Church, gave the Administration of it to* Linus. Which can be look'd upon no otherwise than a Deputation from the Apostles to *Linus* in their Absence,

and this S. *Epiphanius*, in his XX. *Hæreſ.* gives a Reaſon for. — Ἐπισκόπους ἄλλους καθίσαθαι, διὰ τὸ τὸς Ἀποςόλους πολλάκις ἐπὶ τὰς ἄλλας παρεῖναι τὴν πορείαν τέλεσθαι διὰ τὸ κήρυγμα τῦ Χριςῦ, μὴ δύναθαι δὲ τὴν Ρωμαίων πόλιν ἄνευ Ἐπισκόπου εἶναι.— *So might other Biſhops be choſen, becauſe the Apoſtles being gone into other Provinces to preach the Goſpel of Chriſt,* Rome *could not be left without a Biſhop.* But this Point having been already diſcuſs'd by ſeveral learned Pens, I ſhall leave it, only obſerving, that it is not worth the Romaniſts while to lay ſo great a Streſs upon it, ſince it can no Way be made out, who was the immediate Succeſſor of the Apoſtles in the See of *Rome.*

The Decretal Epiſtles of the Popes, (which are for the moſt Part Forgeries, eſpecially for the firſt Seven Centuries) and the falſe and ſuppoſititious Canons of the Councils, impoſed on the World by the Editors, are the main Weapons with which theſe Champions defend their Supremacy and many other Doctrines. Some of theſe Epiſtles have been detected by Dr. *James*, in his *Treatiſe of the Corruptions of the Scriptures, Councils, Fathers,* &c. Likewiſe *Cook*, in his *Cenſura Scriptorum Veterum*, &c. hath diſcovered many impious Frauds in them. And Dr. *Comber* hath in general invalidated their Credit by undeniable Arguments, as far as the firſt Five Centuries. With the Help of theſe therefore, and others well skill'd in Sacred Antiquity, we will enquire into the Lives of thoſe Biſhops of *Rome* upon whom we find theſe Decretal Epiſtles forged; and ſince they claim the Right of appointing and nominating Councils, ſhew the Reader what ſuppoſititious Councils and Canons they have palm'd upon thoſe and ſucceeding Ages to enforce their falſe Doctrines.

The

The first Forgery of a Council is laid so high as the Apostles Time at *Antioch*, and in Defence of Image-Worship, not introduced into the Western Church till Seven Centuries after. This Council, according to *Turrian* the Jesuit, depends upon the single Testimony of *Pamphilus Martyr*, who says there was a Synod of the Apostles held at *Antioch* about some Controversies, in which Synod there were Nine Canons made, which were afterwards found in *Origen*'s Library. The Ninth Canon *gives Leave to make an Image of our Saviour, and of his Servants.* This Canon *Fran. Longus a Corialano* (a great and confident Parasite of the Court of *Rome*, hugs with infinite Pleasure, and boldly asserts *the antient Use of Images from it, in Opposition to the Hereticks of all Ages.* This is so gross an Imposture, that *Labee* touches it very lightly, expressing only one Canon, but lets *Binius* loose, who never fails to defend any, tho' the most improbable Fiction, if it favour any of their unreasonable Doctrines. 'Tis certain this Forgery was never heard of before that infamous Second Council of *Nice*, for neither *Eusebius*, *Socrates*, *Theodoret*, *Ruffinus*, or any of the antient Writers, make Mention of it. But this *Nicene* Council wanted Authority to prove the Doctrine of Image-Worship, and therefore they trump'd up this sham Council to confirm it. I shall next go on with the Decretal Epistles, the first of which is next in Order, intending to take both according to their Date, whether true or pretended.

The Decretal Epistles are very often quoted by the Romanists in the Controversies between them and us, but especially in the Point of Supremacy; for which Reason they all cry them up. But none in their Eulogies come up to *Alphonsus de Castro* and *Gratian*; the first giving them an Equality with the Canons of the Councils, the second ranking them

with the Canonical Holy Scriptures. No Wonder then that theſe Forgeries have gained ſuch Ground as to be incorporated with the Body of the Canon Law in all Countries where the Church of *Rome* prevails.

[*A. D.* 91.] The firſt Parcel in this Bundle of Forgeries are Five Epiſtles inſcrib'd to Pope *Clement*, the firſt of which is quoted by *Hoſius* for *Auricular Confeſſion*, and by *Bellarmine* in Defence of the Supremacy, *&c.* *Confeſſ. Petri*, *c.* 47. *De Rom. Pont. l.* 2. *c.* 14.

Now, that this Epiſtle is adulterate, there are many Arguments to prove. Firſt, it is ſaid in it, that when S. *Peter* ordained *Clement* his Succeſſor, he thus ſpeak to the Congregation: *Obſerve, Brethren, that I ordain this* Clement *to be your Biſhop, and to whom only I deliver my Power of Preaching and Doctrine.* And when *Clement* threw himſelf at S. *Peter's* Feet, and in Modeſty declined the Honour of the Chair, S. *Peter* reſolutely perſiſted. But how can this be, when all, both antient and modern Writers do agree, that *Linus* and *Cletus* were before *Clement.* S. *Auguſt. Ep.* 165. *Irenæus adv. Hæreſ. l.* 3. *c.* 5. *Euſeb. Eccl. Hiſt. l.* 3. *c.* 2. *&c.* This Reaſon hath ſo prevailed with ſeveral *Romaniſts*, that they queſtioned the Truth of this Epiſtle. Thus *Sixtus Senenſis*, *Bibl. l.* 2. *Clemens. This Epiſtle may be queſtioned, for it is very abſurd that* Clement *ſhould be ſaid to ſucceed S.* Peter, *ſince it is plain that* Linus *and* Cletus *were Biſhops before him.* And Cardinal *Cuſanus*, in his *Concord. Cath l.* 3. very bluntly declares, *That their Inconſiſtencies betray them.*

Secondly, There is another Paſſage in it which likewiſe betrays it, and that is of S. *Peter*, ſpeaking thus to *Clement*, *I beſeech thee*, O Clement, *before all that are here preſent, that after I ſhall have paid the laſt*

Debt

Debt to Nature, thou write to James *our Brother, &c.* This likewiſe is too groſs to paſs upon any that conſider; S. *James* died Seven Years before S. *Peter*, as appears from *Joſephus* and *Euſebius*. Certainly he muſt be a very blind Bigot, that can believe S. *Peter* ſhould adviſe *Clement* to write to a dead Man, or that *Clement* ſhould be ſo crack-brained as to write a tedious, ridiculous Letter to a Perſon whom he knew to be dead. This barefac'd Impoſture ſo ſtumbled *Peter Comeſtor, in Hiſt. Schol. in Act. Apoſt. c.* 10. *that he rejects it as ſpurious, poſitively affirming, there can be nothing in it, of* Clement's *Writing to St.* James *after St.* Peter's *Death, that he might be inſtructed by him, ſince it is certain that St.* James *died in the Seventh, and St.* Peter *in the Fourteenth Year of* Nero. The ſame Reaſon likewiſe moved Cardinal *de Turrecremata* to reject this Epiſtle as forged and fabulous, as the aforeſaid *Sixtus Sen.* well obſerves in *Summa de Eccl. l.* 2. *c.* 101.

Thirdly, in this Epiſtle the Word *Primatus*, or Supremacy, is mentioned, which Word was not in Uſe in that Age, nor in many after.

The Second Epiſtle of *Clement* may well be ſuſpected by the Title, which at once blows it up. Clement, *Biſhop of the* Roman *Church, to* James *Biſhop of* Jeruſalem. But St. *James*, as has been already hinted, died before St. *Peter*, and, conſequently, before *Clement* was made a Biſhop. Beſides, this Epiſtle is ſtuffed with Trifles, which nevertheleſs are urged with as much Vehemence as if the Well-Being of the Church depended on them He admoniſhes St. *James*, (who by the Way, ſtood not, I believe, in Need of his Advice) how the Holy Veſſels ſhould be uſed, tells him, *That the Altar-Pall, Chair, Candleſtick and Veil, when grown old and decay'd, ſhould be burn'd, &c.* Can any Man be ſo void of Senſe, as to think St. *Peter* ſhould be

ſollicitous about Things of ſo little Moment; or that St. *James*, the Brother of our Lord, and Collegue with St. *Peter* in the Apoſtleſhip, wanted his Directions in them?

The Third Epiſtle of *Clement* is of the ſame Piece with the Second, and a moſt inauſpicious Blunder of one Word diſcovers the Cheat; *viz. A Presbyter ſhall not ſay Maſs in his* Pariſh *without Leave from his own Biſhop.* Now, that *Clement* could not be the Author of this Epiſtle, and that it was not written till many Years after, plainly appears from *Baronius*, who tells us, *Clement* died in the Year 102. But Pariſhes were not conſtituted nor divided till the Year 261, in which Year Pope *Dionyſius* is ſaid to be alive. And he it was, according to *Polydore Virgil*, who firſt divided the People into *Pariſhes*, *De Invent. Rerum*, *l.* 4. *c.* 9. But the Truth on't is, this Epiſtle was forged for divers Ends, being quoted by ſeveral *Romaniſts* to juſtify the modern Rites of their Church.

Bellarmine, ſpeaking of the Fourth Epiſtle of *Clement*, confeſſes it is doubtful whoſe it is. And if we conſider one Paſſage in it, it would be very unjuſt to father it upon *Clement*. The Paſſage is this: *It is good, and agreeable to Purity, to waſh the Body with Water, for where that outward Purification of the Fleſh is neglected, the Purity of the Mind, and Cleanneſs of the Heart is not obſerved, &c.* Theſe Words would better become one of thoſe Phariſees in the Scriptures, who are ſaid to waſh often, than ſo Apoſtolick a Man as *Clement*. And *Bovius*, in his Preface to the *Clementine Conſtitutions*, making Mention of theſe Epiſtles, ſaith, *There are many Things in them taken from the* Itinerarium, *(another Forgery, and father'd upon* Clement*) which leſſens the Credit of them very much. In one of which, about the frequent Waſhing the Body, there is ſomething not to be born. For the* Ebionites, *who*

who practiſe daily Baptiſm, by theſe Corruptions of Clement, *make St.* Peter *the Author of their Baptiſms.*

The Fifth Epiſtle of *Clement* is like the reſt, for in the Beginning of it *Clement* is ſaid *to write to the Brethren dwelling at* Jeruſalem *with St.* James; which could not be, for (as has been before obſerv'd) St. *James* died Seven Years before St. *Peter*, and *Clement* was not Biſhop of *Rome* till after St. *Peter*, as appears by St. *Jerome de Viris Illuſt.* and other Writers of Eccleſiaſtick Affairs.

[104.] The Second Century begins with the Papacy of *Anacletus*. This Pope, by *Binius*, is ſaid to have done ſeveral notable Feats, but names not one. However, according to Cuſtom, he muſt write Epiſtles, and Three are by the Editors laid to his Charge. The firſt of which is as ridiculous as falſe, for it is quoted by *Pereſius de Trad. par.* 3. *p.* 89. and other Champions of the Pontificate, to prove *Clement*'s firſt Epiſtle to *James* the Brother of our Lord to be genuine: By *Pighius*, *in Hierarch. lib.* 6. *c.* 6. and *Stapleton*, in his *Relect. Contro.* 3. *q.* 7. *Concluſ.* 1. to prove, *That all the World ought to appeal to the* Roman *Pontiff.* And for that Reaſon it is, that *Pereſius* ſo much extolls this Epiſtle, and contrary to all Reaſon and Probability affirms, *This Epiſtle was written by* Anacletus, *who had ſeen St.* Peter, *and was ordained Presbyter by him*, &c. But to prove this Epiſtle ſpurious, we will only conſider;

☞ Note, *That the Author obſerves the Chronology of the Editors in the Series of Time, chiefly that of* Cabbaſutius, *(though he knows it falſe) the better to lead the Reader into the Diſcovery of their Forgeries and Errors.*

1. That

1. That many Paſſages about comparing the Church to a Ship, are taken *verbatim* out of *Clement*'s Firſt Epiſtle; by which this muſt be ſpurious, becauſe *Clement* ſucceeded *Anacletus* Twelve Years after, and by the Title of the Epiſtles, cannot be ſaid to have written them before *Anacletus*'s Death.

2. There is another Paſſage which demonſtrates this Epiſtle to be ſpurious. The Author of it calls *Clement* the Anteceſſor or Predeceſſor of *Anaclete*. Which is quite contrary to the Opinion of the Ancient Fathers, who make *Anaclete* the Predeceſſor to *Clement*: Particularly *Irenæus*, *l.* 3. *c.* 3. *adverſ. Hæreſ.* in expreſs Words: *Fundantes igitur & inſtruentes beati Apoſtoli Eccleſiam, Lino Epiſcopatum adminiſtrandæ Eccleſiæ tradiderunt. Hujus Lini Paulus, in his quæ ad Timotheum Epiſtolis ſunt, meminit.* 2 Tim. 4. 21. *Succedit autem ei Anacletus, & poſt eum tertio loco Apoſtolis Epiſcopatum ſortitur Clemens. The Apoſtles laying the Foundation of the Church, gave the Adminiſtration of it to* Linus; *which* Linus *St.* Paul *mentions in* 2 Tim. 4. 21. *To this* Linus *ſucceeded* Anaclete, *and after him* Clement *was the Third Biſhop.*

The Second Epiſtle attributed to *Anaclete* is of the ſame Leaven with the Firſt; for, beſides the Blunder about *Anaclete*'s Succeſſion, (which is likewiſe here mention'd) the Author of it tells us, That the 70 Diſciples mentioned in St. *Luke* 10. were choſen by the Apoſtles, and not by our Lord.

The Third Epiſtle is quoted by *Bellarmine, de Rom. Pont. l.* 2. *c.* 11, & 14. to prove that St. *Peter* was Biſhop of *Rome* to the Time of his Death; and that the Pope of *Rome* is St. *Peter*'s Succeſſor in the Monarchy of the Church. This they attempt by a barbarous Derivation of the Word *Cephas*, (which in Syriac ſignifies a Stone) from the Greek Word Κέφαλη, *Caput*, and from thence juſtify their imaginary Supremacy.

[110.] Pope *Euariſtus* is the next; of whom, notwithſtanding what the Editors ſay, little can be prov'd; for at that Time the Biſhops of *Rome* made but a mean Figure in the World, and ſcarce any Thing but their Names are to be found upon Authentick Record. However, according to Cuſtom, he muſt father Two Epiſtles, though they are apparently fictitious, as *Contius* proves in his Preface, *c.* 30. *q.* 5.

[119.] *Alexander* aſcends the Papal Throne next; about whom the *Roman Breviary*, *Liber Pontificalis*, *Binius*, *Labbe*, *&c.* make a fearful Squabble, all differing about the Time of his Acceſſion to the Papacy. They likewiſe talk of very great Things of his doing; but nothing is prov'd: Nay, the Perſons ſaid to be converted by him were not at that Time in Being. I am very willing to believe, That the Biſhops of *Rome* in theſe early Days were Men plentifully ſtor'd and adorn'd with Learning, Piety, and all Chriſtian Virtues, and therefore cannot eaſily be induced to entertain a Belief of the abominable Impoſtures father'd on them: Nay, ſome ſo impious, as to tranſpoſe the very Words of the Holy Scripture, and apply them baſely to countenance ſome whimſical Rite or ridiculous Ceremony. A Taſt of which let the Reader take from the Firſt Epiſtle of this Pope, which I take to be one of the groſſeſt Abuſes of its Kind. This Epiſtle, you muſt know, was invented to confirm certain modern Rites, which the Editors would have the World believe were very ancient: And therefore *Bellarmine*, *de Rom. Pont. l.* 2. *c.* 14. quotes it to defend the Papal Supremacy, and to prove, That Water mix'd with Salt is powerful toward the purging away of Sins. *De Cultu Sanct. l.* 3. *c.* 7. This is done by a moſt violent as well as impious Diſtortion of the Holy Scripture: For whereas

whereas St. *Paul*, in *Heb.* 9. 13, 14. ſays, *If the Blood of Bulls and Goats, and the Aſhes of an Heifer ſprinkling them that are unclean, ſanctifieth, as touching the Purifying of the Fleſh; How much more ſhall the Blood of Chriſt*, &c *purge your Conſcience from dead Works?* Theſe are the Words of the Text. But in this Epiſtle of Pope *Alexander*, inſtead of the Words, *How much more ſhall the Blood of Chriſt?* they profanely foiſt in, *How much more ſhall Water mix'd with Salt, and conſecrated by our Prayers, ſanctify and cleanſe the People?*

The Author of this Epiſtle is guilty of another great Overſight; for in it he is very prolix about the *Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Trinity*, profeſſing he received ſuch Doctrines from the Fathers of the Church. But the Word *Trinity*, and the Doctrine of it, was not delivered till after the Second Century; whereas it is moſt certain, that Pope *Alexander* lived about the Year 120.

The Date of this Epiſtle likewiſe betrays it: But that is a Fault incidental to moſt of the decretal Epiſtles, and therefore I ſhall not inſiſt on it here.

The Second Epiſtle of this Pope is diſcoverable by a ridiculous Expoſition of *Hoſea* 4. 8. *They eat up the Sins of my People*; which, if compar'd with the Context, plainly ſhews, That by *Eating up the Sins of the People*, is there meant the Prieſts conniving at and encouraging the People in their Sins. But this awkward Expoſitor will have *Eating up the Sins of the People*, to imply *the Dignity of Prieſts, who by their Prayers and Offerings eat up the Sins of the People.* He will not find St. *Jerome* of his Side in this Expoſition.

The Third Epiſtle ſhews it ſelf by its falſe Latin: *Cavete vos Fratres, &c.* Beſides the falſe Date of Conſuls, of which the Second is likewiſe guilty. But *Azorius* the Jeſuit gives them their due Chara-

Character; for he plainly ſays, *That the Epiſtles of Pope* Alexander I. *are very queſtionable as to their Authority.* Coc. p. 30.

[130.] The *Pontifical* will have Pope *Xiſtus*, or *Sixtus*, to die a Martyr; though it's no where elſe mentioned: And to enlarge his Figure a little more, a Couple of Epiſtles are aſcribed to him. The Firſt of which *Bellarmine* makes Uſe of to prove the Book of *Baruch* to be Canonical Scripture, and is dated under the Conſulſhip of *Adrian* and *Verus*, who were not Conſuls in *Sixtus*'s Pontificate. *Gratian* quotes the Second Epiſtle, in Defence of *Appeals to the Patriarch of* Rome: And *Baronius* and *Bellarmine* from thence will have *Sixtus* call'd *Biſhop of the Univerſal Church.* This bears the ſame Date with the other, and conſequently is of equal Credit.

[140.] The next Pope is *Teleſphorus*, who makes but a poor Appearance in the *Pontifical*, having but one Epiſtle aſcrib'd to him, which is cited by *Durant, de Rit. Eccleſ. Cath. l.* 2. *c.* 1. *n.* 6. to prove that the Word *Maſs* was very ancient among the Latins. This Epiſtle is one of them which *Azorius* confeſſes wants Authority: However, to make up what is wanting in the Pontifical, the Notes lay it on at once, by telling us, *That this Pope ordain'd Thirteen Biſhops, who were to go into all Parts of the World.* From whence they infer, *That the Biſhop of* Rome *was not only to take Care of* Rome, *but of the whole World.*

[152.] *Hyginus* is as obſcure as his Predeceſſor; and therefore, to ſet him off the better, the *Pontifical* makes him to do what *Clement* had been ſaid to do before him, which was to diſtribute the Orders among the Clergy; and to make him a little more faſhionable, allow him to have written Two Epiſtles; but ruin the Credit of them by dating

them

them in the Conſulſhip of *Magnus* and *Camerinus*, though there was no ſuch Perſon as *Magnus* mention'd in or near thoſe Times.

[156.] The Editors cannot agree about *Pius* and *Anicetus*, whether was firſt; which plainly proves what little Care was taken about their Succeſſion, and conſequently how uncertain it muſt be: However, we'll follow their own Account, and take Pope *Pius* next; whoſe Epiſtles are cited by *Bellarmine*, to prove the Papal Supremacy, *De Rom. Pont. l.* 2. *c.* 14. And yet, with incomparable Aſſurance, ſays, *He dare not affirm theſe Epiſtles to be of undoubted Authority.* How ridiculous then is it to quote a Forgery in Vindication of ſo darling a Topick as the Supremacy? And truly, we cannot but think *Baronius* affected with the ſame Stupidity, when we find him, in his Annals, *T.* 2. *ad An.* 167. *n.* 3. vindicating by theſe Forgeries what he might have juſtified by many ancient and authentick Canons of both Greek and Latin Churches; *viz. That what was once given to Divine Uſes ſhould not be profan'd by humane Service.* Sacrilege was always ſo abominable a Sin, that the moſt early Times took Care to reſtrain and prevent it; and therefore they need not have had Recourſe to Fictions to defend the Church againſt it. It would have look'd honeſt in both, if they had ingenuouſly told the World, that theſe Epiſtles were ſuppoſititious; which they might ſafely have done, for *Baronius* (whoſe Skill in Chronology was too great to make ſuch a Blunder) very well knew, That *Clarus* and *Severus*, under whoſe Conſulſhip theſe Epiſtles are dated, were never Conſuls together.

[165.] *Anicetus*'s Epiſtle about ſhaving his Prieſts Crowns is ſuſpected by *Bellarmine*, becauſe, *perhaps* (ſays he) *it bears a falſe Title*; which appears in the End of the Epiſtle; for it is dated in the Conſul-

Conſulſhip of *Gallicanus* and *Rufinus*, whom we do not find either in *Baronius*, or any other eminent Writer, to have been Conſuls at the ſame Time: And yet this Epiſtle, groundleſs and falſe as it is, muſt paſs for genuine Teſtimony in Behalf of the *Supremacy*. *Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. l.* 2. *c.* 14.

[173.] The Second Epiſtle of *Soter* is cited by *Durant, de Rit. Eccl. Cath. l.* 1. *c.* 9. to prove the *Romiſh Thurification*, or Offering of Incenſe, to be a Primitive Inſtitution: But this is likewiſe diſcovered by the Date; for there were no ſuch Men as *Cethegus* and *Clarus* Conſuls in the Time of *Soter*. But there is one Overſight in the Lives of theſe Popes, *Anicetus* and *Soter*. The Pontifical tells us they were both buried in the Burial-Place of Pope *Caliſtus*; but it is certain, that *Caliſtus*, who gave this Burial-Place, died above Fifty Years after *Anicetus*. But *Binius*, to colour this, ſays, *You muſt underſtand it in that Place where* Caliſtus *afterwards built a Cœmitery*. But this cannot make it out, for *Soter*, *Anicetus*'s Succeſſor, was buried there likewiſe.

[177.] There is no better Authority for the Epiſtle of *Lucius*, King of *Britain*, to *Eleutherius*, and *Eleutherius*'s Anſwer, than the *Pontifical*: Which will not do; for from that very Fragment (*c.* 30. *q.* 5. *judicantem*) it is plain, *That they were the Words of the Emperor* Conſtantine *to* Theodoſianus *above an Hundred Years after* Eleutherius's *Time, and which the Forger of this Epiſtle, concealing the Name, patch'd up.* Contius, c. 30. q. 5. *Vid.* Collier's *Ch. Hiſt. T.* 1. *p.* 15. *&c.*

[192.] Thundering Pope *Victor*'s boiſterous Treatment of the Eaſtern Biſhops made no ſmall Noiſe in thoſe Times; of which, *Euſebus, l.* 5. *c.* 23, 24, *&c.* ſpeaks at large. This Pope's Firſt Epiſtle is quoted by *Bellarmine, de Rom. Pont. l.* 2. *c.* 14.

to prove the Supremacy; *and that the Popes of* Rome *were call'd Biſhops of the Univerſal Church.* But the Authority of this Epiſtle is like that of the reſt; for it is dated in the Conſulſhip of *Commodus* and *Gratian*; though, according to *Baronius*, there were no ſuch Conſuls during the Papacy of *Victor.*

The Second Epiſtle of this Pope is quoted by *Lindanus*, to prove, *That all Biſhops ought to appeal to the Biſhop of* Rome. But this Epiſtle diſcovers it ſelf, as well as that of *Eleutherius*, to have been written by ſome ignorant Monk, by beginning with the Word *Enim*, and the falſe Latin in it, *Perlatum eſt ad Sedem Apoſtolicam, aliquos NOCERE FRATRES velle:* Which the Editors of all Things ought to take Care of, and not to charge the Infallible Univerſal Biſhop with.

[201.] *Zepherine*'s Two Epiſtles are of no better Credit than any of the former, bearing Date under Conſuls whom *Marian* about theſe Times does not mention.

[219.] The *Pontifical* and the *Notes* tell many ridiculous Fables concerning *Calixtus*; which the latter would ſeem to correct by a more ridiculous Author, *viz.* the Roman Martyrology: All indeed of like Credit. The Firſt Epiſtle of this Pope is cited by *Bellarmine, de Pon. Oper. c.* 19. *& in Lib.* 2. *de Rom. Pont.* for the Pope's Supremacy, and to prove the Book of *Tobias* to be *canonical.* The Second Epiſtle of *Calixtus* appropriates to *the See of* Rome *alone the Power of tranſlating of Biſhops from one City to another.* This Arrogance of the *Roman Pontifs* was ſo far from being allowed by the Greek Church, that the Firſt *Nicene* Council, *Can.* 15, 16. and the Council of *Carthago, A. D.* 419. *Can.* 52. poſitively forbid the Thing. But whatever End theſe Epiſtles were made to anſwer, 'tis certain their Authority is very queſtionable: For though

Bellarmine confidently quotes them both as Authentick Teſtimonies, in Defence of what he there urges, yet he tells us he dare not affirm theſe Epiſtles to be genuine, *de Rom. Pont. l.* 2. *c.* 14. To what End then does he quote what he dare not ſtand by? But all People are not ſo curious as to enquire into the Truth of theſe Authorities, but take all for granted that theſe faithleſs Oracles vent. But *Antonius Auguſtinus* tells the plain Truth of the Matter, *viz. That the Perſons who were employed at* Rome *to correct* Gratian, *rejected the Epiſtles of* Calixtus. De Emend. Gratian. l. 2. dial. 4.

[224.] There are ſeveral idle and groundleſs Stories in the Life of Pope *Urban* in the *Pontifical*; none of which are more trifling and frivolous than an Epiſtle father'd on him, and quoted by *Bellarmine, de Confirm. l.* 2. *c.* 3. to prove *Confirmation to be a Sacrament.* And yet this very *Bellarmine*, ſpeaking of the Epiſtles of *Clement*, *Melchiades*, *Euſebius*, and this *Urban*, owns, *That it is not certain whether they were the Authors of them whoſe Names they bear*: Which is pretty plain by this Epiſtle, for it is dated in the Conſulſhip of *Antoninus* and *Alexander*, who, if we may believe *Baronius*, were never Conſuls during the Pontificate of *Urban*.

[231.] The many Barbariſms in the Epiſtle aſcribed to *Pontianus* plainly ſhew it to be a Counterfeit. This Epiſtle may probably give Occaſion to that idle Fable of St. *Peter*'s being *Porter of Heaven*; for the Author of it exciting People to ſeveral Chriſtian Duties, *promiſes them the Reward of Eternal Glory by Jeſus Chriſt, and that St.* Peter *ſhould open to them the Gate of Glory.* Theſe are meer Dreams of old Women, to make St. *Peter* Porter of Heaven, as if the Gates of it were not equally committed to all Paſtors of the Church with St. *Peter.*

[235.] *Anterus*'s Epiſtle is one of the moſt ſcandalous Impoſtures that can be invented; for in it there is Mention made of one *Euſebius* Biſhop of *Alexandria* at that Time or thereabout: But there was no ſuch Man as *Euſebius* Biſhop of *Alexandria* in or near theſe Times: For *Nicephorus* (*Bibl. vet. Patr. Tom.* 7. *Edit.* 3.) reckoning up the Biſhops of *Alexandria* to *Peter*, who was the Fifty ſecond, and preſided over that Church to the Year 640, makes no Mention of *Euſebius*. This Epiſtle, notwithſtanding it is ſo notorious a Forgery, is quoted by *Stapleton* againſt *Horn* Biſhop of *Wincheſter*, *l.* 4. *fol.* 468. in Favour of the Supremacy. By *Vermierus*, to prove the Real Preſence, *fol.* 15. By *Turrian*, *pro Epiſt. Pont. l.* 4. *c.* 14. to prove the Propagation of the Faith out of certain ſpurious Things which paſs under the ſham Name of *Euſebius* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, *&c.*

[236.] Pope *Fabian* is ſaid to have written Three Epiſtles, and which for notorious Falſhood come not ſhort of any that go before: For in the Firſt it is affirmed, That *Novatus* and *certain other Confeſſors, were come from* Afric *in the Time of* Fabian, *and had departed from the Church of Chriſt*, &c. Now it is plain from *Euſebius*, and all others, (according to *Baronius*, *An.* 238. *n.* 9, 10.) That this muſt be in the Papacy of *Cornelius*: Nay, *Baronius* himſelf at laſt is forced to call this Epiſtle ſpurious.

After *Bellarmine*, *de Verb. Dei*, *l.* 1. *c.* 6. had quoted the Second Epiſtle of this Pope, to prove ſeveral Traditions, and that the Materials of Confirmation were *Oil* and *Balſam*, *de Confirm. c.* 8. in the very ſame Place he queſtions the Credit of this Epiſtle. But the greateſt Fraud is in the Third Epiſtle, which from one End to the other is taken out of the Decrees of Pope *Sixtus* III; as *Peter Crabb* very honeſtly obſerves in the Margin of this Epiſtle,

Epiſtle, *Tom.* 1. *p.* 118. *col.* 2. which Pope *Sixtus* III. lived about 200 Years after *Fabian*. Happy Wits, to jump together from ſo great a Diſtance! The Date of this Epiſtle is likewiſe falſe, for *Africanus* and *Decius* were not Conſuls whilſt *Fabian* was Pope, as appears from *Baronius*.

In this Pope's Time there were Two Councils held, one at *Lambeſe* in *Africa*, againſt *Privatus* the *Heretick*, and the other at *Boſtra* in *Arabia*, in the Cauſe of *Beryllus*, Biſhop thereof. Theſe Two Councils the Editors will have entitled under *Fabian*; though the Two only Writers that mention them, *viz.* St. *Cyprian*, *Epiſt.* 55. *ad Cornel.* and *Euſebius*, *l.* 6. *c.* 33. take no Notice of *Fabian* in either of them; from whence we may very fairly conclude he had no Concern there: For about that Time there was a great Intimacy between the Church at *Rome* and at *Carthage*, often adviſing and aſſiſting one another, but aſſuming no Power to judge or cenſure each other, but in a Synodical Way.

[251.] *Cornelius*'s Epiſtles are quoted to prove many new and unheard of Doctrines in the Primitive Church. The Firſt is cited by *Bellarmine*, and many others, to prove the *Invocation of Saints*, *Tranſlation of Relicks*, &c. *Bellarm. de Sanct. Beat. l.* 2. *c.* 19. *de Imag. l.* 2. *c.* 3. But this Epiſtle is ſpurious; which appears from that idle Fable of the Tranſlation of the Bodies of SS. *Peter* and *Paul*, which is mention'd in this Epiſtle; but was impoſſible to be done in the Time of a raging Perſecution. Beſides, the Date of it is falſe, for *Decius* and *Maximus* were not Conſuls in the *Pontificate* of *Cornelius*, according to *Baronius*.

The Second Epiſtle is quoted by *Ivo*, in *Decret. l.* 4. *to prove, that Clergymen ought to appeal no where*

but to the See of Rome; and by *Gratian* for several other Causes: But if any one will take the Pains to compare this and the foregoing with the genuine Epistles of *Cornelius*, which are extant in St. *Cyprian* and *Eusebius*, he will find so great a Disparity both in Style and Matter, as must condemn them as spurious and adulterate.

Whatsoever Councils were held during this Pope's Time, whether in *Afric* or *Italy*, they are by the Editors entitled under him, as if call'd by his Authority: But if we look into St. *Cyprian*'s, 43, 45, 55, 59 *Epist. Edit. Ox.* we shall find the *Carthaginian* Councils at that Time call'd by St. *Cyprian*'s Authority alone; and the Decrees of the Second Council of *Carthage*, (which was the First of St. *Cyprian*) about receiving the *Laps'd* again into Communion, were not authoritatively confirm'd by the First Council of *Rome* under *Cornelius*, but approv'd and consented unto by that Council; which is very clear from the Words of St. *Cyprian*, in his 55 *Epist. ad Anton.* Cornelius *himself, and several of his Brethren the Bishops, consented with us in the same Decree*, &c.

[253.] The Editors are at a great Loss about Pope *Lucius*, differing very much in their Accounts of his Death. However, according to Custom, he must Leave an Epistle behind him, which is to serve some great Ends. This Epistle is quoted by *Bellarmine, de Rom. Pont. l.* 2. *c.* 14. to prove *the Bishop of* Rome *St.* Peter's *Successor in the Ecclesiastick Monarchy*; and in *l.* 3. *c.* 5. *de Verb. Dei, That the said Bishop teaching from the Chair, cannot err.* Again, *de Rom. Pont. l.* 4. *c.* 3. *That there never could be found any in the Chair of St.* Peter, *that taught contrary to the Faith.* But for this Infallibility, I refer the Reader to *Marcellinus* and *Liberius*, (not to name others) who often laps'd and return'd, according to their

own

own Accounts. But notwithſtanding the great Topicks which Cardinal *Bellarmine* pretends to prove from this Epiſtle, in the aforeſaid *l.* 2. *c.* 14. *This Epiſtle is one of thoſe which he owns he dare not affirm for authentick*; and no Wonder, ſince it is dated under the Conſulſhip of *Gallus* and *Voluſian*, who were not Conſuls in the Time of *Lucius*, according to *Baronius*.

[255.] We come next to that troubleſome Pope *Stephen*, who gave *Cyprian* and the *African* Biſhops much Diſturbance about the *rebaptizing Hereticks*: Which Controverſy makes it plainly appear how inconſiderable the Authority of the Biſhop of *Rome* was beyond his own Diſtrict. The Editors indeed, after their uſual Manner, and without a Scruple, intitle all Councils, whereſoever held, or by whomſoever call'd, under their own Biſhop; though, as in this Caſe, between the *African* Biſhops and the Biſhop of *Rome*, ſeveral Councils were call'd without the Biſhop of *Rome*'s Knowledge, and which condemn'd even his Opinion: But nothing more than *Cyprian*'s Behaviour to Pope *Stephen* ſhews that at that Time (and I know no Reaſon why not all his Succeſſors afterwards) the Biſhop of *Carthage*, and other *African* Biſhops, allowed the Biſhop of *Rome* no Superiority over them. St. *Cyprian* in his Epiſtle to Pope *Stephen*, (which is the 67th in the *Antwerp* Edit.) after he had uſed ſeveral Arguments and Admonitions to perſwade *Stephen* to join with him and the reſt of the *African* Biſhops in receiving the *Laps'd*, lets him know, that they had a Share with him in the Care and Government of the Church, *Nam etſi Paſtores multi ſumus, unum tamen gregem paſcimus, &c. For though we are many Paſtors, yet we have but one Flock; and we ought to gather together and cheriſh all thoſe Sheep which Chriſt purchaſed with his Blood.* And if we

conſider the whole Purport of this Epiſtle, we ſhall plainly find this Infallible Judge in Danger of lapſing, or at leaſt of favouring Hereticks. For *Cyprian*, to rowſe him, tells him, *Servandus eſt anteceſſorum noſtrorum beatorum Martyrum Cornelii & Lucii Honor glorioſus, &c. We muſt keep up the Honour of our Anceſtors, thoſe bleſſed Martyrs* Cornelius *and* Lucius, *whoſe Memory ought to be honoured by us, but much more by you, moſt dear Brother, who are become their Vicar and Succeſſor.* But at the End of his 72d Epiſtle, to this ſame Pope *Stephen*, he gives a final Concluſion about the ſo much affected Supremacy in the Biſhop of *Rome*. *Nec nos vim cuiquam facimus, aut legem damus, cùm, &c. Nor do we compel any by Force or Law, for every Biſhop has free Liberty of exerciſing Juriſdiction in his own Dioceſs or Church.* *Firmilianus*, Biſhop of *Ceſarea*, wrote a long and bitter Epiſtle to St. *Cyprian*, ſharply inveighing againſt the Arrogancy of the Biſhop of *Rome* in ſeveral Things, *Ep.* 75 *Antwerp. Edit. p.* 196. All which ſhew, that there was little Regard had to the Biſhop of *Rome* when he aſſumed what did not of Right belong to him. And the foreſaid *Firmilianus* called the Council of *Iconium*, which decreed in Oppoſition to the Biſhop of *Rome*. As did the Council of *Synnada*, and ſeveral *African* Councils; but eſpecially the Eighth *Carthaginian* (which is the Seventh of St. *Cyprian*). For when Pope *Stephen* would not acquieſce and conſent to the Decrees of former Synods, but talked big, and threat'ning; St. *Cyprian*, to ſhew how little he valued his Menaces, reſolved to put an End to the Controverſy in a full Synod, where, beſides Prieſts and Deacons, and a great Number of Lay-men, there were preſent 87 Biſhops, who unanimouſly ſign'd the Decree for *Rebaptizing Hereticks*, which the *Univerſal Biſhop*, with

with all his pretended Authority, could neither prevent nor contradict.

[257.] Neither the Editors nor the Notes can agree about Pope *Sixtus* the Second, both miſtaking the Perſon, and the Time of his Death. Which ridiculous Squabble the Notes labour, but in vain, to reconcile. However a Pope they muſt have, and he muſt be called *Sixtus* the Second, whom the *Pontifical* blunderingly miſtakes for *Sixtus* the Philoſopher. [Excellent Authority indeed for Sacred Antiquity!] And to make him the more faſhionable, he muſt have an Epiſtle tack'd to his Life, which Epiſtle is cited by *Lindanus* to prove, *That all Appeals ought to be made to the Biſhop of* Rome. *Panopl. l.* 4. *c.* 89. But this Epiſtle has the Misfortune of the former, for it is dated under *Valerian* and *Decius*; tho' it is plain that no Annals from *Brute* to *Juſtinian*, (in whoſe Time the Office of Conſuls was laid aſide) can produce ſuch Perſons for Conſuls.

[258.] The Editors likewiſe are at a great Loſs about Pope *Dioniſius*, differing very much in the Names and Times of the Conſuls during this Papacy. But to make him look ſomewhat conſiderable, and to keep up the old Story of the *Supremacy*, they publiſh a ſham Council at *Rome* under this Pope, and pretend, (to ſhew the Biſhop of *Rome*'s Power) that *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, for certain Miſdemeanors, was cited thither to clear himſelf, which he, ſay they, ſo far obey'd as by Letter to clear himſelf. And to juſtify this, no leſs than the Teſtimony of *Athanaſius* will ſerve, and which with their uſual Aſſurance they quote. But it is moſt certain, that *Athanaſius* ſays nothing of this *Roman* Council, or the Citation of *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*; only that this *Dionyſius*, hearing he

was accuſed, wrote an Apology to vindicate himſelf.

The Two Councils of *Antioch*, which were called in the Caſe of *Paulus Samoſatenus*, were called without the Knowledge of Pope *Dionyſius*; which is plain from *Euſebius*, *l.* 7. *c.* 22. who does not ſo much as mention the Pope. And conſidering the grand Appearance of ſo many eminent Men in the Church at that Time, ſuch as *Gregory Thaumaturg*, Biſhop of *Neoceſarea*, his Brother *Athenodorus*, *Helenos* of *Tarſus*, *Nicomas* of *Iconium*, *Hymeneus* of *Jeruſalem*, *Theothecnus* of *Ceſarea* in *Paleſtine*, *Firmilianus* of *Ceſarea* in *Cappadocia*, and *Maximus* of *Boſtre*; all or moſt of which made a much more conſiderable Figure in the Church at that Time than the Biſhop of *Rome*, it is not to be wonder'd at that he ſhould not be taken Notice of. Beſides, as *Firmilianus* was Preſident of this Council, who had ſo roughly treated Pope *Stephen*, calling him *Judas*, *Schiſmatick*, *a Favourer of Hereticks*, *Enemy to the Church*, *inſolent*, *inhumane*, &c. it is very improbable he ſhould ſubmit to allow the Biſhop of *Rome* a Supremacy, either in calling or managing theſe Councils. See *Firmil. Epiſtle to St. Cyprian.* But it is plain from *Euſebius*, *l.* 7. *c.* 30. that Pope *Dionyſius* knew nothing of theſe Councils, but from the Synodical Epiſtle which was ſent to him, to *Maximus* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, and other Biſhops of the Catholick Church. Which plainly ſhews what little Share the Biſhop of *Rome* had in theſe Councils, and how unjuſtly the Editors palm an Univerſal Monarchy in the Church upon thoſe who did not ſo much as claim it.

[270.] After the Editors have made a great Buſtle to prove Pope *Felix* I. a Martyr, they barbarouſly miſquote St. *Cyprian* to juſtify their offering the Sacrifice of the Maſs for the Dead. But St. *Cy-*

St. *Cyprian*'s Words in *l.* 3. *Ep.* 6. *Dies eorum quibus excedunt*, &c. ſhew the Cheat. *Obſerve the Days*, ſays he, *in which they depart, that we may commemorate them among the Martyrs.* 'Tis certain by this Epiſtle, that St. *Cyprian* ſpoke this only of the Confeſſors who died in Priſon, that they might be recogniz'd among the Martyrs, which is far from juſtifying their modern Practices.

There are Three Epiſtles attributed to this Pope, the firſt of which is cited by *Gratian*, to prove, *That Primates ought not to paſs any Sentence upon a Biſhop without the Authority of the Biſhop of* Rome. The Second is likewiſe cited by him, to prove, *That Accuſers, who cannot make out what they alledge, ſhall not hereafter be admitted to give their Teſtimony.* The Third Epiſtle is cited by *Bellarmine, de verb. Dei, l.* 3. *c.* 5. to prove, *That the Biſhop of* Rome *in the Chair cannot err.* The Firſt Epiſtle is dated under the Conſulſhip of *Claudius* and *Aurelianus*, the Second and Third under *Claudius* and *Paternus*. But if *Baronius* may be believed, there were no ſuch Conſuls in the Time of *Felix* the Firſt.

[275, 283.] The *Pontifical* and the Notes cannot agree about the two following Popes, *Eutychianus* and *Gaius*. I ſhall therefore leave them to themſelves, and only take Notice of the Epiſtle of the latter, which is cited by *Bellarmine, de Clericis, l.* 1. *c.* 28. to prove, *That Clergymen ought not to be puniſhed by a Lay-Judge.* But this Epiſtle is for the moſt part taken out of *Leo* I.'s Epiſtle to the *Paleſtines*, and another to *Leo* the Emperor. There is likewiſe a great deal of it in *Agapetus*'s Epiſtle to *Anthimus* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, for which Reaſon *Baronius* reckons it ſpurious.

[296.] We come next to one of the great Inſtances of humane Weakneſs in the *Infallible Judge*, in the Perſon of Pope *Marcellinus*, the laſt of this Cen-

Century, whom both the *Pontifical* and the *Notes* own to have ſacrificed to Idols; but whilſt *Binius* endeavours to juſtify him, he makes him blacker; for he ſays, *Tho' he denied the Faith by outward Acts, yet by his inward Acts he did not believe any Thing contrary to the Faith.* And in *page* 175. *col.* 1, 2. he ſays, *The ill Deeds of Biſhops may hurt themſelves, but cannot prejudice the Church's Orthodox Doctrine.* 'Tis granted; but I hope, that theſe Guides will not pretend to be infallible, after ſuch conſpicuous Failings. But how ſtrangely do ill Habits improve! Beſides the many Blunders and Inconſiſtencies in the Life of this Pope, to colour over all, they feign a Council near *Sinueſſa*, in a ſevere Perſecution under *Diocleſian*, where Three hundred Biſhops met in a Cave that could hold but Fifty, where they abſurdly bring *Marcellinus* to judge and condemn himſelf. And tho' they ſay, *That by this Pope's Fall the whole Chriſtian Religion was in Danger*, yet notwithſtanding, their Univerſal Eccleſiaſtick Monarch muſt be infallible, and every ſham Council, that does but favour any darling Topick, ſhall paſs for genuine. This Pope muſt not part without an Epiſtle, tho' it be a moſt manifeſt Forgery. The Second Epiſtle of *Marcellinus* is cited by *Bellarmine*, for the ſame Purpoſe as that of Pope *Gaius*, *viz. That Clergymen ought not to be puniſhed by a Lay-Judge. De Cler. l.* 1. *c.* 28. But *Baronius*, ſpeaking of this *Marcellinus*, ſays, *that he remembers only one Epiſtle, which he wrote to one* Salomon, *a Biſhop.* But the foreſaid Second Epiſtle is patch'd up out of ſeveral Authors. The Firſt Part of it is taken *verbatim* out of Pope *Hormiſda*'s Epiſtle to the Biſhops of the Province of *Betica*. The Second Part is to be found in the Epiſtle of Pope *Antherus* and *Euſebius* to the Biſhops of *Tuſcany* and *Campania*; and at the latter End there are ſome Paſſages which are taken

out

out of Pope *Caliſtus*'s Decrees. This Pope's Life is ſo ſtuff'd with Abſurdities and Inconſiſtencies, that it muſt needs prejudice any diſintereſted Perſon, and make him loath ſuch confident Paraſites as dare affirm ſuch Contradictions for Truth.

[304.] Pope *Marcellus* was a Perſon of ſo obſcure a Character, that *Euſebius* and *Theodoret* knew nothing of him. But to fill up a Vacancy of Seven Years, (which the *Pontifical* owns, and the *Notes* deny) two Names are foiſted in: And (which is a very common Thing among the Editors) there is more ſaid of the moſt obſcure and worthleſs, or of feigned Perſons, than of the moſt real and deſerving. The ſhameful Fiction of this *Marcellus*'s Life and Death, is by the *Roman Breviary* appointed to be read to the People for Leſſons in their Churches. His Epiſtle to the Biſhops of *Antioch* about the Supremacy is a ridiculous Story; for who will believe that the Biſhop of *Rome* ſhould contend for Superiority in the midſt of a flagrant Perſecution, or that St. *Peter* by Inſpiration tranſlated his Seat from *Antioch* to *Rome*? Yet theſe notorious Falſhoods are defended by the Notes as if they were genuine Truths. *Bellarmine* cites this Epiſtle, *De Rom. Pont. l.* 2. *c.* 14. to prove the *Supremacy*; and *Lib.* 1. *c.* 12. *de Conc.* to prove, that *no General Council ought to be called without the Order of the Biſhop of* Rome. *Lindanus* alſo quotes this Epiſtle, to prove, *That all Biſhops ought to appeal no where but to* Rome. *Panopl. l.* 4. *c.* 89. To prove all which, the *Editors* cite an *Apoſtolical* and *Nicene* Canon, tho' no ſuch Canons are to be found. *Labb. T.* 1. *p.* 950. *Bin. p.* 175. *col.* 2 *Baron. An.* 296. *n.* 5. Yet this Epiſtle is one of thoſe which *Bellarmine*, in the foreſaid Quotation, confeſſes he dare not affirm for genuine, becauſe it bears Date under the Conſulſhip of *Maxentius* and *Maximus*, who are taken Notice

of

Century, whom both the *Pontifical* and the *Notes* own to have ſacrificed to Idols; but whilſt *Binius* endeavours to juſtify him, he makes him blacker; for he ſays, *Tho' he denied the Faith by outward Acts, yet by his inward Acts he did not believe any Thing contrary to the Faith.* And in *page* 175. *col.* 1, 2. he ſays, *The ill Deeds of Biſhops may hurt themſelves, but cannot prejudice the Church's Orthodox Doctrine.* 'Tis granted; but I hope, that theſe Guides will not pretend to be infallible, after ſuch conſpicuous Failings. But how ſtrangely do ill Habits improve! Beſides the many Blunders and Inconſiſtencies in the Life of this Pope, to colour over all, they feign a Council near *Sinueſſa*, in a ſevere Perſecution under *Diocleſian*, where Three hundred Biſhops met in a Cave that could hold but Fifty, where they abſurdly bring *Marcellinus* to judge and condemn himſelf. And tho' they ſay, *That by this Pope's Fall the whole Chriſtian Religion was in Danger*, yet notwithſtanding, their Univerſal Eccleſiaſtick Monarch muſt be infallible, and every ſham Council, that does but favour any darling Topick, ſhall paſs for genuine. This Pope muſt not part without an Epiſtle, tho' it be a moſt manifeſt Forgery. The Second Epiſtle of *Marcellinus* is cited by *Bellarmine*, for the ſame Purpoſe as that of Pope *Gaius*, *viz. That Clergymen ought not to be puniſhed by a Lay-Judge. De Cler. l.* 1. *c.* 28. But *Baronius*, ſpeaking of this *Marcellinus*, ſays, *that he remembers only one Epiſtle, which he wrote to one* Salomon, *a Biſhop.* But the foreſaid Second Epiſtle is patch'd up out of ſeveral Authors. The Firſt Part of it is taken *verbatim* out of Pope *Hormiſda*'s Epiſtle to the Biſhops of the Province of *Betica.* The Second Part is to be found in the Epiſtle of Pope *Antherus* and *Euſebius* to the Biſhops of *Tuſcany* and *Campania*; and at the latter End there are ſome Paſſages which are taken

out

out of Pope *Caliſtus*'s Decrees. This Pope's Life is ſo ſtuff'd with Abſurdities and Inconſiſtencies, that it muſt needs prejudice any diſintereſted Perſon, and make him loath ſuch confident Paraſites as dare affirm ſuch Contradictions for Truth.

[304.] Pope *Marcellus* was a Perſon of ſo obſcure a Character, that *Euſebius* and *Theodoret* knew nothing of him. But to fill up a Vacancy of Seven Years, (which the *Pontifical* owns, and the *Notes* deny) two Names are foiſted in: And (which is a very common Thing among the Editors) there is more ſaid of the moſt obſcure and worthleſs, or of feigned Perſons, than of the moſt real and deſerving. The ſhameful Fiction of this *Marcellus*'s Life and Death, is by the *Roman Breviary* appointed to be read to the People for Leſſons in their Churches. His Epiſtle to the Biſhops of *Antioch* about the Supremacy is a ridiculous Story; for who will believe that the Biſhop of *Rome* ſhould contend for Superiority in the midſt of a flagrant Perſecution, or that St. *Peter* by Inſpiration tranſlated his Seat from *Antioch* to *Rome*? Yet theſe notorious Falſhoods are defended by the Notes as if they were genuine Truths. *Bellarmine* cites this Epiſtle, *De Rom. Pont. l.* 2. *c.* 14. to prove the *Supremacy*; and *Lib.* 1. *c.* 12. *de Conc.* to prove, that *no General Council ought to be called without the Order of the Biſhop of* Rome. *Lindanus* alſo quotes this Epiſtle, to prove, *That all Biſhops ought to appeal no where but to* Rome. *Panopl. l.* 4. *c.* 89. To prove all which, the *Editors* cite an *Apoſtolical* and *Nicene* Canon, tho' no ſuch Canons are to be found. *Labb. T.* 1. *p.* 950. *Bin. p.* 175. *col.* 2 *Baron. An.* 296. *n.* 5. Yet this Epiſtle is one of thoſe which *Bellarmine*, in the foreſaid Quotation, confeſſes he dare not affirm for genuine, becauſe it bears Date under the Conſulſhip of *Maxentius* and *Maximus*, who are taken Notice

of

of by none about that Time, but the infamous *Pontifical*.

The Second Epiſtle to *Maxentius* is quoted by *Gratian*, to prove, *That no Synod ought to be called without the Authority of the Biſhop of* Rome. *Diſt.* 17. *Synod.* It's ſtrange they ſhould pick up no better Authorities for their Doctrines than Forgeries, of which there is not a more manifeſt one than this Epiſtle. For in the firſt Place, it's dated under the ſame Conſuls as the former, and conſequently of no better Authority. In the next Place, it's plain that Part of it is taken out of *Gregory*'s Epiſtles, writ almoſt 300 Years after this. *Labb. p.* 951. *Bin.* 387. *col.* 1. Beſides, *Baronius* himſelf ſays there are many Inconſiſtencies that render it ſuſpicious, *An.* 308. *n.* 24. particularly, that of ſhutting up young Children in Monaſteries, and of ſhaving and veiling them, which Cuſtoms were not introduc'd till ſeveral Centuries after.

[305.] The Council of *Elvire*, in *Spain*, is the next in Courſe. This was a Council of Orthodox Biſhops, as very plainly appears by the many excellent Canons relating to Church-Diſcipline, and which ſet before us the Severity and Strictneſs of Primitive Piety. Yet rather than loſe their dear Supremacy, (for which they have broach'd ſo many Falſhoods, and invented ſo many Forgeries) this Council muſt be ranged under a Biſhop of *Rome*, *viz. Marcellus*, tho' it may be moſt juſtly queſtioned, whether there ever was ſuch a Man in the World, as has been before obſerv'd. But the Editors cannot agree among themſelves about the *Man*. *Binius* will have it under *Marcellus*; *Caranza* ſays, it was about the Time of Pope *Silveſter*; but *Labbee* leaves it out of the Title. This Council made ſeveral Canons which directly oppoſe the Practices of the *Roman* Church, as the 26th Canon, which con-

contradicts their *Saturday Faſts*, and which *Caranza* moſt unjuſtly alters in the very Title of it, in theſe Words, *Every* Saturday *ought to be a Faſt*. The 34th, under poſitive Pain of Excommunication, forbids Wax Candles to be lighted in the Day-time in the Burying-Places of the Saints. Yet ſee how *Caranza*, in a ſhort Annotation, ſoftens this. *But now*, ſays he, *the Church proves that Wax Candles ought to be lighted in the Day-time by its Practice.* Such Authority as this will juſtify any, tho' the moſt impious Practice. But he goes on, and ſays, *This Council therefore means not thoſe, who publickly light up Wax Candles for the Worſhip and Glory of God; but Novices, who in Imitation of the Gentiles lighted Candles.* What will not they entertain, who will accept of ſuch blundering Expoſitions. Though the 36th Canon (which decrees, *That Pictures or any Thing that is worſhip'd, ſhall not be painted on Church-Walls*) is rejected by many *Romiſh* Writers, who thought it could no Way be coloured by an Expoſition or Annotation; yet the Notes boldly make this Canon aſſert what it confutes, by ſaying, *That it aſſerts the Honour and Worſhip due to Holy Images.* A pretty Way of arguing! Yet though this Council frequently condemns the modern Opinions and Practices of the Church of *Rome*, *Binius* dare not reject it, as ſome do, becauſe Pope *Innocent* approves it; but however he varniſhes thoſe *Canons* which affect them with ſuch Gloſſes, as he would have the World believe, this Council meant diametrically oppoſite to its own Decrees.

[309.] Pope *Euſebius*, as well as *Marcellus*, (as has been obſerv'd) was foiſted into the Catalogue, to fill up a Vacancy of Seven Years. Tho' he was as obſcure as his fictitious Predeceſſor, no Author of Note mentioning any Thing memorable of him, yet he muſt write Epiſtles; and Three

are laid to his Charge, which are cited upon ſeveral Occaſions by *Bellarmine*. But theſe Cheats are ſo plain, that any Reader muſt bluſh at the Impudence of the Forgers, who dare impoſe ſuch Falſhoods on the World. *Labbee*, *p.* 1380. in the Margin, ſhews from what modern Authors they are ſtolen, and poſitively calls them ſpurious, yet does not reject them. To what End then do they publiſh what themſelves own to be falſe and Counterfeit? Surely they lightly value their Church's Authority or Doctrines, who ſupport either by ſuch infamous Proofs.

[311.] Having coloured over this Seven Years Vacancy with the ſham Pontificates of *Marcellus* and *Euſebius*, they continue their Succeſſion (for that muſt be kept up at any Rate) with *Melchiades*, about whom the *Pontifical* and *Baronius* can't agree, one ſaying he reigned Three Years and ſeven Months, the other, that he reigned Two Years and two Months. No great Matter which! But then they ought to have been a little more exact in the Date of it, for by dating it under the Conſulſhip of *Voluſian* and *Rufin*, *Melchiades* muſt be ſuppoſed to have written this Epiſtle when he was dead. But that's a ſmall Fault! Yet, notwithſtanding this Epiſtle is ſo juſtly charged with Want of Credit, *Bellarmine* makes uſe of it to prove the *Univerſal Monarchy of the Church in the* Roman *Pontiff. l.* 2. *c.* 14. and that *Confirmation* is a *Sacrament. De Confirm. l.* 2. *c.* 3. But whoever was the Author of this Epiſtle, it is certain that the Beginning is taken out of Pope *Celeſtin*'s Epiſtle to the *French. Labb. T.* 1. *p.* 1395. And to vindicate an *Apoſtolick Privilege*, which they pretend was granted by our Bleſſed Saviour to St. *Peter*, *viz. That the Judging of Biſhops was ſolely reſerved to the Biſhop of* Rome, they quote the 74th and 75th *Apoſtolick Canons*, which give it quite

againſt them, and place the *Dernier reſort* in a Synod. Now to quote an Author or Text in any Caſe, that does but barely ſeem to countenance or favour any Argument, is but Shuffling; but when Men ſhall poſitively refer to a Canon to juſtify their bold Aſſertions, and this Canon or Canons are directly contrary to what they lay down for Truth, theſe Men ſurely muſt have more than a common Share of Impudence, or elſe ſuppoſe that the World will believe all they ſay, and never trouble themſelves to diſprove them, by recurring to the Paſſages quoted. But this is the common Method, or elſe they would not dare to tell us ſo many of theſe Decretal Epiſtles are forged, and yet at the ſame Time defend them with Notes, and quote them upon Occaſion for authentick Records. Thus *Bellarmine*, in this very Epiſtle, after he had quoted it for Proof, (as is already mentioned) at laſt tells us, *This is one of thoſe Epiſtles which he cannot warrant.* A very pretty Way of perſwading People to believe that to be true, which they ſee to be apparently falſe! Certainly this muſt be their Perſwaſion, or elſe to imagine the Ignorance of the People to be ſo groſs, that they might impoſe any Thing on them, otherwiſe they would not in this Pope's Time ſo ridiculouſly mention the Council of *Nice*, which was not called till ſome Years after, and in another Pope's Time.

[313.] During the Papacy of *Melchiades*, there was a Council called at *Rome* by the Command (as *Cabbaſutius* ſays, which is much to be wondered at) of *Conſtantine*. And ſo far was the Pope from being diſtinguiſhed above others at that Time, that he was, by Delegation from the Emperor, join'd in Commiſſion with Three *French* Biſhops, and whom the Emperor in his Epiſtle calls his Collegues. And the Complaint againſt *Cecilian* Biſhop

of

of *Carthage*, which was the Cauſe debated in this Council, was, tho' determined here, reheard in a *French* Council. By this Delegation it's plain the Supremacy and Infallibility had hitherto gained no Ground.

[314.] The Council of *Arles*, which the Editors own was called by the Command of *Conſtantine the Great*, is in many Places ſtrangely perverted by them in Favour of their *Dear Supremacy*; which nothing weakens more than the very Title: For if it was called by *Conſtantine*'s Command, the Pope, who was obliged to obey, could not be *Supream*, nor was the ſole Power of calling Councils veſted in him. 'Tis pretty, truly, to ſee the Editors ſhuffling and tricking, tho' but for a Shadow of Grandeur. *Peter Crab*, in the Title, plainly tells us, that this Council of *Arles* was held in the Time of *Conſtantine* and *Sylveſter*; but *Longus a Corialano*, that bold and confident Paraſite of the Court of *Rome*, ſays, *The Council of* Arles *was held in the Time of Pope* Sylveſter *and the Emperor* Conſtantine. This Author joins with *Binius* juſt ſuch another as himſelf, in a ridiculous idle Story about the Emperor *Conſtantine*, as if, *at the Requeſt of the Emperor, two hundred Biſhops met. Among whom* Claudius *and* Vitus, *Presbyters, and* Eugenius *and* Cyriacus, *Deacons, ſat as the Pope's Legates, aud preſided in this Council.* Very likely indeed that this Biſhop's Legates ſhould take Place of the Emperor!

It's notoriouſly known, that *Conſtantine* was born of Chriſtian Parents, and educated under them, and was Thirty Years old when he enter'd on the Empire: And from the Year 306. *Baron. Ibid. n.* 14. he profeſs'd openly he was a Chriſtian, encouraging Converts, ſuppreſſing Paganiſm, building and endowing Churches, *&c.* And therefore, whilſt *Conſtantine* was doing ſo much for the Good

of

of the Church, *Sylveſter* muſt not be idle, but muſt ſeem to make a Figure, though it be made up of nothing but Abſurdities and Improbabilities; ſuch as his miraculouſly curing *Conſtantine* of a Leproſy, which he never had; his Baptizing of him, and ſhewing him St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*; his Perſecution under *Conſtantine*, and Flight to the Mountain *Soracte*; the great Figure he made at the Council of *Nice*, tho' no Author of any Credit takes the leaſt Notice of him as any Way concerned in it, further than that he had two Proxies there; the Editors indeed make a mighty Buſtle about him, as if he called the Council, and preſided in it by his Legates, *Hoſius*, *Vitus*, and *Vincentius*. *Vitus* and *Vincentius* indeed were his Proxies there, as *Socrates* ſays, *l.* 1. *c.* 5. But *Hoſius* is named by no Body as a Preſident, except the Editors. They try all the Ways they can to prove theſe Three to be Legates and Preſidents, and among the reſt they foiſt in the Subſcriptions to the Canons of this Council to prove them ſo. But theſe, ſays *Richerius*, *Hiſt. Gen. Concil. l.* 1. *c.* 2. *n.* 6. are of as little Credit as the Epiſtle to *Sylveſter*. It is ſtrange they ſhould invent ſo many ridiculous Fables, and ſuch as are eaſily contradicted! The Preface to this Council ſays, that *Conſtantine* ſat on a gilded Throne below all the Biſhops; but *Euſebius*, who was an Eye-Witneſs, ſays, he ſat above all the Biſhops, *Vit. Conſtant. l.* 3. *c.* 10. As for the Preſident of this Council, I think it is very plain from *Baronius*, *An.* 325. *n.* 73. who he was, even the ſame Perſon that called it, *viz.* the Emperor; for, ſays he, *He acted the Part of a Moderator in it.* This is much from *Baronius* indeed; but Truth will out ſometimes. And yet *Richerius* (though a *Romaniſt*) goes further; *Hiſt. Con. c.* 2. § 2, 3, 4. ſaying, *It is clear by undoubted Teſtimonies, that the Appointing, Con-*

vening,

vening, and Preſidency of this Council depended on the Authority of Conſtantine. And he blames *Baronius* and *Binius* for wilfully miſtaking the Pope's Conſent (which was requiſite as he was Biſhop of an eminent Church) for his Authority, to which no Pope in that Age pretended. But a Proof, though a falſe one, muſt be fetch'd from early Antiquity to juſtify modern Abuſes and Incroachments.

It's certain from *Socrates, Proœm. l.* 5. that after the Emperors became Chriſtians, Matters of the Church ſo far depended on them, that it was by their Summons the greateſt Councils were called. In which, as *Euſebius* ſays, *l.* 1. *Conſt. M. vitæ, c.* 37. *They ſat and preſided as* Communes Epiſcopi. And *Conſtantine* himſelf called this Council of *Nice, Ut pacem redderet Eccleſiæ, ac Diſciplinam Eccleſiaſticam ſanciret, &c. That he might reſtore Peace to the Church, and eſtabliſh her Diſcipline, ibid.* which at that Time was in great Danger of being ruined by the powerful Encroachments of *Arius* and his Diſciples; and therefore it was Time for the Emperor to interpoſe his Power, and preſerve the Church, which was in *apparent Danger*, by calling a Council. Not that he took upon him the Part of an arbitrary Judge, or domineering Tyrant, to determine Matters *ad libitum*; for, *Diſſidium inter Epiſcopos ſubortum, & ad ſe ab Epiſcopis delatum placavit, He appeaſed the Diſputes among the Biſhops, ibid. l.* 3. *c.* 6. *ad* 24. And tho' as Emperor, he was Defender, and ſat Firſt in the Council, yet he was not ſole Preſident, for that himſelf diſclaims. *Euſeb. de vit. Conſt. l.* 4. *c.* 24. *Vos intra, ego extra Eccleſiam Epiſcopus a Deo conſtitutus*; *Ye are Biſhops within the Church, without the Church I am a Biſhop appointed by God.* And *Euſebius* ſays, *ib. l.* 3. *c.* 13. of the Emperor, that, *ſuam Orationem Præſidibus Concilii conceſſiſſe.* From whence it is plain, there were other Preſidents; which *Felix* III. in his

his Epiſtle to the Emperor *Zeno*, allows: For he ſays, *Euſtathius*, Patriarch of *Antioch*, *Præſidendi munus obiit*, *acted the Part of a Preſident*. And *Photius*, *l. de 7. Synod*, ſays, that *Alexander* Biſhop of *Alexandria* preſided. In ſhort, the Patriarchs, as Chiefs of their Clergy, ſat above all the reſt: Yet ſo as they gave Place to the Emperor when he came in.

[336.] *Sylveſter* is ſucceeded by Pope *Mark*, who muſt not go off without making ſome Noiſe, and therefore they invent the moſt improbable Story imaginable, to make the World believe, that *Athanaſius* ſent an Epiſtle to Pope *Mark*, to deſire him to ſend a true Copy of the *Nicene* Canons from *Rome*, becauſe the *Arians* had burnt theirs at *Alexandria*. To which Pope *Mark* anſwers, that he had ſent him 70 Canons. This by the Way is to perſuade the World into a Belief of a greater Number of Canons conſtituted at *Nice* than Twenty. Which being ſo ſcandalous an Impoſture, it may not be unpleaſant to ſhew the Reader the Uſes they were made to ſerve. They pretend there Eighty Canons made by this Council, which were tranſlated out of *Arabick*, and publiſh'd by thoſe Two modeſt Jeſuits, *Turrianus* and *Alfonſus Piſanus*. How theſe Canons crept into *Arabick* I can't find, nor is it worth while to enquire, tho' without Doubt the two pious Editors of them had ſome great End in it. The Champions however of the *Pontificate* make the following Uſes of theſe Canons. The Thirtieth Canon is cited by *Bellarmine*, *l.* 1. *c.* 26. *de Baptiſmo*, to prove, *That the Children of Chriſtians ought not to be baptiz'd by Gentile Names*. The Nineteenth and Twentieth are quoted by *Stapleton*, *Pr in. Fid. Doctrin. Relect. p.* 398. to prove, *That it belo*^{n}*gs to the Biſhop of* Rome *only to confirm Councils, and that all Appeals ought to be made to him only*. The Forty

fourth is cited by *Cope, Dial.* 1. *c.* 12. in Defence of the *Supremacy*. The Sixty ninth is made Uſe of by *Bellarmine, l.* 1. *de Extrem. Unc. & l.* 2. *de Confirm. c.* 8. to prove, *Extream Unction to be a Sacrament; and that the Chriſm, which is the Material of the Sacrament of Confirmation, ought to be conſecrated and bleſſed firſt.* And the Sixty fifth is cited by *Coccius, To.* 2. *Theſaur. Cath. l.* 7. *p.* 850. in his Queſtion about Prayer for the Dead. Now that theſe Canons are ſpurious, nothing is more certain and plain; for *Cecilian* Biſhop of *Carthage*, who was preſent at this Council of *Nice*, reckons but Twenty. *Con. Carth.* 6. *c.* 9. St. *Auguſtine*, and Two hundred *African* Biſhops, knew no more. St. *Cyril* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, and *Atticus* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, *Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 1. *c.* 6. ſay there were Twenty, no more nor leſs. The ſame appears likewiſe by *Ruffinus, Iſidore*, and *Theodoret, in Princip. Conc. de Syn.* And notwithſtanding the Annotator in *Labbé*, with a great deal of Aſſurance and Impertinence, ſays, *That it is manifeſt there were more than Twenty Canons made in this Synod*; yet, after all his Bluſtring and Nonſenſe, he dare not defend thoſe Canons which *Turrian* and *Piſanus* father'd on this Council. Nay, their Oracle *Baronius* flies in their Face, and calls them Lyars; for, Theodoret *affirms there were but Twenty Canons made in this Council*, ſays he, *An.* 325. *n.* 156. *Vid. Coc. cenſur. p.* 227. 228.

But after all this Noiſe and Struggling, to prove what never was, it plainly appears that this pretended Judge of all Controverſies, and ſupream Head of the Church, had ſo little Share in the Tranſactions of this Council, that it is very uncertain in what Pope's Time it was called. *Sozomen, Hiſt. l.* 1. *c.* 16. and *Nicephorus, l.* 8. *c.* 14. ſay, it was in the Time of *Julius*. Others think it was in *Sylveſter*'s Time. *Phocius* affirms, it was in the Times

of both *Sylveſter* and *Julius*, *de 7. Syn.* though it is to be conſidered that Pope *Mark* came between.

But to return to this Epiſtle of Pope *Mark*, let us conſider the Uſe made of it. Though *Binius* cites it to prove the *Supremacy* and *Infallibility* of the Biſhop of *Rome*, and that there were more than Twenty Canons made at the Council of *Nice*; yet in his Notes he gives Five Reaſons to prove them falſe, and *Labbé*, *T.* 2. *p.* 469. in the Margin, condemns them as ſpurious. Likewiſe *Bellarmine*, tho' he with *Baronius* and others ſuſpects this Epiſtle, uſes it to prove the papal *Infallibility* and Succeſſion of St. *Peter* in the Eccleſiaſtick Monarchy, *De Verb. Dei*, *l.* 3. *c.* 5. It is quoted by *Canus*, *Loc. com. l.* 6. *c.* 4. to prove the Seventy Canons of the Council of *Nice*; and it is called by *Coſter*, in his *Enchirid. Controv.* 3. *The moſt famous Epiſtle.* But it is moſt deſervedly rejected by *Nannius* as ſuppoſitious for theſe Reaſons; 1. When the Controverſy was about the Number of the *Nicene* Canons between the Church of *Afric*, and the Popes *Zozimus* and *Boniface* I. (which was near an Hundred Years after) this Epiſtle was not ſo much as heard of, or any Way known. *Baron. An.* 336. *n.* 59. 2. In this Epiſtle it's ſaid, Pope *Marcus* ſent into *Egypt* to *Athanaſius* the Seventy Canons of the Council of *Nice*, which *Athanaſius* in his Letter to this Pope had deſired of the Church of *Rome*. But this cannot be, according to *Baronius*, *An.* 336. *n.* 59. for this very Year *Athanaſius* was baniſh'd into *France*. 3. This Epiſtle has the uſual Stamp of Impoſture upon it, for it is dated the X. *Cal.* of *November*, in the Conſulſhip of *Nepotian* and *Facundus*, whereas on the Nones of *October* this very Year it is plain Pope *Mark* was dead. *Baron. ibid.*

[336.] Pope *Julius* ſucceeds *Mark*. And here the *Pontifical* and *Baronius* are together by the Ears again about the Conſuls, in which the former is very much miſtaken. In this Pope's Name ſeveral Epiſtles are publiſhed: Two of which are ſufficiently proved falſe by *Cook*, *p.* 101, 102. The Firſt is cited by *Bellarmine*, *de Rom. Pont. l.* 1. *c.* 23. to prove, *That all Conſecration and Dignity is to be had of the Church of* Rome. It is alſo cited by *Greg. de Valent.* to prove, *The Biſhop of* Rome *for the Time being to be St.* Peter's *Succeſſor*. And by *Harding* againſt *Jewel*, *That all Things muſt have their Sanction from the Biſhop of* Rome. But this Epiſtle is diſcovered by the old Mark; for it is dated in the Conſulſhip of *Felicianus* and *Maximian*, tho' *Baronius* owns no ſuch Perſon as *Maximian* in the Pontificate of *Julius*, *An.* 337, *&c.*

The Second Epiſtle againſt the *Eaſtern* Biſhops in the Behalf of *Athanaſius*, is cited by *Bellarmine*, to prove, *That by a Decree of the Council of* Nice *all Cauſes of Moment ought to be decided by the Apoſtolick See. De Verb. Dei*, *l.* 3. *c.* 7. And by *Canus* in his *Loc. Com. l.* 6. *c.* 4. that by a Decree of the ſame Council, *All Biſhops ought to appeal to the See of* Rome. But this is as eaſily proved a Forgery as any of the other. For, 1. It is, as the former, dated under the Conſulſhip of *Felician* and *Maximian*. 2. It is utterly different from that undoubted and genuine Epiſtle of *Julius* which is to be ſeen in *Athanaſius*, *Apolog.* 2. 3. It mentions many *Nicene* Canons, which are not to be found either in *Cecilian*'s, *Cyril*'s, or *Atticus*'s Copies, nor in any Author of Credit who collected the Canons of that Council. 4. This Epiſtle was no more known in the Time of the foreſaid Controverſy between the *African* Church and Popes *Zozimus* and *Bonifacius* I. than Pope *Mark*'s Epiſtle. By theſe and ſuch like Arguments

guments even *Baronius* gives up the Cauſe, and declares he ſuſpects this Epiſtle for a Forgery.

The Third Epiſtle from *Julius* to the *Arians*, is by *Baronius* and others own'd to be a Forgery, *Lab. T. 2. p.* 483. *Bin. p.* 387. *col.* 2. And *Binius*, in his Notes upon it, ſaith, *It is falſe, corrupted, and ſtolen out of divers Authors. Bin. p.* 391. *col.* 1. Yet the ſame *Binius* baſely and unjuſtly quotes it over and over for the *Supremacy*, the Nullity of Councils not called by the Pope, and the Number of the *Nicene* Canons.

The Fourth Epiſtle is genuine, and if compared with the ſpurious ones, plainly ſhews it ſelf to be authentick, both by the Style and Matter. No bullying for Superiority, but written in an humble Manner, without any Pretence or Claim to the modern Grandeur.

One Thing is worth noting in this Pope's Time, all his forg'd Epiſtles are dated under the foreſaid miſtaken Conſuls; but his genuine Epiſtles bear no Date. They likewiſe put the ſame Date to a *Sham Roman* Council, with which they, to ſhew their Authority, pretend to confirm the *Nicene* Council. But this is ſo plain a Cheat, that not only the Date condemns it, but *Labb. Margin T. 2. p.* 527. ſays, 'tis patch'd up out of many Authors, and by that old Juggler *Iſidore* lick'd into the Shape of Council. They pretend to have 117 Biſhops in it, and *Baronius* and the Notes very methodically argue about the Time of this Sham Council, and the Biſhops that ſat in it, purely to perſuade People into an Opinion of it, and that it was called for nothing but to confirm the Council of *Nice*, whoſe Acts and Canons could not be of any Force, till they had received their Sanction from him.

There were ſeveral Councils called during the Pontificate of *Julius*, which the Editors will have

called by the Authority of this Pope, though he had nothing to do in them: As in the Council of *Antioch*, which was called by the Emperor *Conſtantius*, who was preſent at it, and cauſed what Decrees he pleaſed to paſs in it; and to ſhew how little they valued the Biſhop of *Rome*, they decreed quite contrary to him in the Caſe of *Athanaſius*. The Second Council of *Rome* under this Pope, I grant, was called by *Julius*; but Cardinal *Baronius* is guilty of the groſſeſt Diſingenuity poſſible: For having firſt ſaid, that *Athanaſius* and his Enemies having referred the Matter in Debate to *Julius*'s Arbitration, and *Athanaſius* coming to *Rome* after this Reference was, *Baronius* very unfaithfully makes this Inference from it; *Behold the Cuſtom for injur'd Biſhops, even from the* East, *to come to the Biſhop of* Rome *for Redreſs. Baron. An.* 340. *n.* 2.

[342.] The *Eaſtern* Biſhops, in a very ſharp Epiſtle, expoſtulated with *Julius* in his Third *Roman* Council, for taking upon himſelf ſo far as to cite them to *Rome*, or to pretend to judge any Thing already determined by them in their own Synods. Which ſo ſoften'd *Julius*, that inſtead of claiming any Authority over them, he becomes a ſuppliant Orator for *Athanaſius*.

It is worth Notice, that the Council of *Antioch*, though compoſed of *Arians*, who had made a new *Creed*, is entitled under *Julius*; but this is to keep up the pretended *Supremacy*, though in a very infamous Way.

They extol the Council of *Sardis* to the Skies, becauſe it ſpeaks ſome Things which ſeem to favour them; and therefore they would perſuade us that they had ſomething to do in it. But it was ſo very little, that they neither called it, nor preſided in it. For if we will believe *Sozomen*, *l.* 1. *c.* 19. *Socrates*, *l.* 2. *c.* 16. and *Theodoret*, *l.* 2. *c.* 5. we

ſhall

ſhall find, that the Emperors *Conſtans* and *Conſtantius* gave Order for this Council to meet. And tho' the Preface boldly affirms, that *Hoſius, Archidamus* and *Philoxenus*, preſided in the Name of Pope *Julius*, which is directly falſe; it's certain *Julius* ſubſcribed by his two Presbyters, *Archidamus* and *Philoxenus*, who properly were his Legates; and for *Hoſius*, it's plain he was no Pope's Legate, for he ſubſcribed in his own Name.

It is plain, that when *Athanaſius* and his Enemies referr'd their Cauſe to the Arbitration of *Julius*, they referr'd it to him as a Judge choſen by them, and not to him as Univerſal Eccleſiaſtick Monarch; and therefore when *Urſacius* and *Valens*, two *Arian* Hereticks, abjur'd their Hereſy, and recanted their falſe Evidence againſt *Athanaſius*, they went to *Rome*, and in Writing delivered their Recantation to Pope *Julius*, who having before been Arbitrator in the Cauſe, was the fitteſt Perſon to receive theſe Men's Confeſſions. Yet from hence the Notes make this baſe Inference, *That ſince the Matter was greater than that a Synod at* Milan (*tho' the* Roman *Presbyters were preſent at it*) *could diſpatch it, and leſt the ancient Cuſtom of the Catholick Church ſhould be broken*, viz. *for eminent Hereticks to abjure their Hereſies only at* Rome, *they ſent them to* Julius, *that having before him their penitential Letter, they might make their Confeſſion, the whole* Roman *Church looking on.* This is ſo ſly an Inſinuation, that none but Men of the moſt profligate and corrupt Morals would from thence make ſuch baſe Inferences. It is very unreaſonable to ſuppoſe, that when two Parties choſe a ſingle Arbitrator in one particular Caſe, that upon this Arbitration, an univerſal Supremacy in all other Caſes ſhould be founded. As Pope *Julius* was by both choſen Arbitrator, he was the propereſt Perſon to receive the Confeſſions of the Delinquents;

linquents; but it is very prepoſterous from thence to conclude, that it always was the Cuſtom for eminent Hereticks to abjure their Hereſies at *Rome*. Beſides, it is plain from the Council held at *Jeruſalem*, *A. D.* 350. that Hereticks, and eminent ones too, no leſs than Biſhops, have recanted their Hereſies at other Places than *Rome*. For *Athanaſius*, upon his Return from Baniſhment at *Jeruſalem*, was preſent at a Council called there by *Maximus*, Biſhop thereof, without the Knowledge or Conſent of the Biſhop of *Rome*. At which Time thoſe Biſhops who had before ſubſcrib'd to the Sentence againſt *Athanaſius*, recanted their Fault, and abjur'd the *Arian* Hereſy in the Preſence of *Athanaſius*. There could not be more eminent Hereticks at that Time than *Arians*, nor more conſiderable Men for Figure in the Church than Biſhops; yet ſuch as theſe they were that repented, and abjur'd their Hereſy, and were reſtored to the Communion of the Church, without offering to go, or being cited to *Rome* to recant there.

Before we leave this Pope, I will do him more Honour in a ſhort Truth of him, than all the fawning Sycophants have by their fulſome Falſhoods. For when they meet with an advantageous Piece of authentick Hiſtory, they murder the Perſon repreſented in it by ſome incredible Lie. As to Pope *Julius*, he was certainly right in the Caſe of *Athanaſius*, and acted with the Sincerity becoming a Biſhop of the Firſt See. He pleaded heartily for him to the *Eaſtern* Biſhops that had condemned him, that being Biſhop of an Apoſtolical See, *viz. Alexandria*, they ought not to have condemned him, till they had acquainted the Biſhops of the *Weſt*, and eſpecially him as the Firſt, that ſo the Matter might have been debated and determined in Council. *Baron. An.* 341. *n.* 56, 57. It

is

is a great Scandal to the Church of *Rome*, that many of their Biſhops, who were Men of great Piety and Goodneſs, ſhould have their Memories daub'd by the Pens of ſuch nauſeous Flatterers: For it is certain many of them would appear more glorious in their true Characters, and more becoming that high Poſt they held in the Church, if theſe Pretenders to Antiquity had not undertaken the Deſcription of them, and Things which they had no Ground for.

[352.] We come next to the greateſt Inſtance of humane Frailty that Eccleſiaſtick Hiſtory affords, in the Perſon of Pope *Liberius*; whoſe many Fallings from the Church into Hereſy ſhew the *Infallibility* to be but ill founded in St. *Peter's* Chair. The Editors and the Notes are ſo very hardly put to it to cover theſe Failings of one of their *Infallible* Guides, that all their Doubles and Shifts cannot blind any Reader of common Capacity. The Charge againſt him is poſitive and unanſwerable, and from themſelves. *Binius*, in his Notes on 7 *Ep. Liber. Labb. T.* 2. *p.* 751. *Bin. p.* 470. *col.* 1. ſays, *he unhappily fell:* And *Labb. p.* 743. and *Bin. p.* 466. *col.* 2. That *he baſely fell*; and that *he conſented to the Depriving of* Athanaſius, *admitted* Arians *to his Communion, and ſubſcribed an* Arian *Confeſſion of Faith*, as *Athanaſius*, *Hilary*, and *Hierome*, witneſs. Yet they will not own he erred in Faith, *but that by his Falling he caſt a baſe Blot upon his Life and Manners.* Lab. 783. Bin. 479. col. 2. And though they have poſitively ſaid, That he communicated with *Arians*, (which, I think, or nothing, makes a Man a Heretick) yet they impudently ſay, *It is a falſe Calumny of the Hereticks, to ſay*, Liberius *was infected with the* Arian *Hereſy.* Lab. 741. Bin. 465. col. 2. In the Life of *Liberius*, *p.* 50. *Platina* ſays, *Liberius* did in all Things *agree with the Hereticks, and was of the*

the same Opinion with the Arians. And can this Man be said to be Orthodox? Yes; and Cardinal *Baronius* will affirm it: For notwithstanding, *An.* 357. *n.* 33, 34, *&* 35. he owns, *That* Liberius *subscribed Heresy*, (the Cause of which, by the way, (as the Cardinal, *ibid.* acknowledges) was his Ambition of regaining his Bishoprick;) yet he a little after denies, that Liberius *was an Heretick*, pretending that he sign'd the First Confession of *Sirmium*, which was not down-right Heresy; tho', *An.* 359. *n.* 10. he declares, That the Catholick People of *Rome* esteemed *Liberius* to be an Heretick, and would not have Communion with him; for which he cruelly persecuted them. A pretty Way of reconciling Contradictions, to make an Heretical Persecuting Pope Orthodox! And yet they are so full of these, that the very Pope *Felix*, who was put into *Liberius*'s Place by *Arians*, must be a good *Catholick*. And now, after all that *Bellarmine*, *Baronius*, *Binius*, *Labbé*, and all the Champions for the Pontificate, can say or do, they cannot but own, (nay, they do, and then deny it) that they have had Two Popes at once falling so notoriously into Schism, that the very Lay-People refused their Communion.

There are several Epistles, with a Preface before them, palm'd upon this Pope; *Two of which*, which seem to be the most genuine, this Preface saith, *were feigned by the* Arians, *Lab. p.* 744. *Bin. p.* 467. *col.* 1. and *yet these Two are found in the Fragments of St.* Hilary, *among which it is not probable there should be any Fiction of the* Arians. But that which makes them reject this Epistle is because they say, Liberius *did condemn* Athanasius *in the Beginning of his Papacy*. Nor was this the only Time that he condemned *Athanasius*.

When

When he wrote his Seventh Epiſtle, which they allow to be genuine, he was an *Arian* without Diſpute; for he calls the Arian *Biſhops, his moſt beloved Brethren, allows the Condemnation of* Athanaſius *to be juſt, and owns his receiving the Sirmian Creed as Catholick.* Lab. p. 751. Bin. 469. col. 2.

The Eleventh Epiſtle of this Pope is genuine, for it is recorded by *Socrates, l.* 4. *c.* 11. and yet the Notes, to hide *Liberius*'s being a Heretick, ſoftly ſay, he was *ſo eaſy, as to receive the* Semi-Arians *to Communion, and to commend their Faith, as the ſame which was decreed at* Nice. A fine Fetch indeed, to call his Erring in Matters of Faith *Eaſineſs*, and his being Deceived a Token of his *Infallibility!*

The Twelfth (or, as *Labbé* calls it, the Fourteenth) Epiſtle, is a manifeſt Forgery. *Lab. Ep.* 14. *p.* 760. *Bin. Ep.* 12. *p.* 472. *col.* 2. And ſo are the Two next, as *Binius* and *Labbé* confeſs. *Lab.* 763. *Bin.* 474. *col.* 2. But the Forger of this Epiſtle had but a bad Hand at Chronology; for he abſurdly brings in *Liberius* under *Julian* or *Valens*, (in one of whoſe Reigns this Epiſtle was written) *threatening Offenders with the Emperor's Indignation, with Deprivation; yea, with Proſcription, Baniſhment, and Stripes.* Labb. p. 767. Bin. 474. col. 2.

Nor have the Friends of the Pontificate, by theſe ridiculous Stories and Forgeries, leſs wounded their Imaginary *Supremacy*, than their *Infallibility*. In which *Liberius* was no ſmall Inſtrument; for in his Eleventh Epiſtle he ſtyles himſelf only Biſhop of *Italy*, and ſaying, *He was the meaneſt of Biſhops, and rejoiced that thoſe in the Eaſt did agree with him in Matters of Faith.* But *Baronius* uſes a very unfair Way to conceal this Condeſcention of the Pope, for he alters the Pointing; *Liberius Epiſcopus, Italiæ & alii, &c.* making *Liberius* the Grand Biſhop, and the reſt

reſt Biſhops of *Italy*. But theſe Tricks are not ſtrange Things with them.

Their Fondneſs in affirming all Councils were or ought to be call'd by the Pope only, hath betray'd them to much Contempt, and expoſed them for their notorious Diſingenuity. Nay, the Power of the Biſhop of *Rome*, not only in *Liberius*'s Time, but long after, was ſo inconſiderable, that though *Liberius* call'd a Council at *Rome*, *A. D.* 352. to clear *Athanaſius*; yet, being ſenſible how inſignificant his Authority was, he and the reſt of the Biſhops agreed to petition the Emperor for another Council, to confirm what they had done at *Rome*.

The Council of *Milan*, which they vainly call a General Council, though in *Italy*, and under the Pope's Noſe, was not, as they ſay, call'd by *Liberius*, but by the Emperor *Conſtantius*; for *Sozomen* poſitively declares, *l.* 4. *c.* 8. *That* Conſtantius *ſummoned all the Biſhops to* Milan; and *Baronius*, *An.* 355. *n.* 2. ſaith, *the Emperor call'd them together*.

As to that idle Notion, That none but the Pope can call a *General Council*, it's plain they impoſe upon the World, and contradict themſelves too: For the Council of *Ariminum*, which the Editors ſtyle a *General Council*, is not entitled under him, nor ſaid to be call'd by him, (for he had no Hand in it) but, as is on all Hands agreed, was call'd by the Emperor *Conſtantius*, *Sulpic. Sever. Hiſt. l.* 2. who call'd for the Decrees of this Synod to confirm them, *Lab. p.* 794. *Bin. p.* 482. *col.* 2. which the Orthodox Biſhops obey'd. And it's certain, that what *Conſtantius* in his Epiſtle declares, *about the Unreaſonableneſs of a Weſtern Council determining any Thing againſt Eaſtern Biſhops*, excluded the Biſhop of *Rome* from all Power of calling Councils out of his proper Diſtrict. This is plain from *Athanaſius*'s Calling a Council at *Alexandria*, *A. D.* 362. upon his

Return from his Third Exile. This Council was call'd upon the Account of ſome Differences among the Catholicks, about the Manner of explaining the Trinity, and on what Terms recanting *Arians* were to be received into the Church. And though neither *Athanaſius*, nor any ancient Hiſtorian, mention the Pope in this conſiderable Action, yet the Editors out of *Baronius* ſay, *it was call'd by the Advice and Authority of* Liberius: Which cannot fairly be ſuppos'd, for *Liberius* at that Time was an *Arian*, and therefore very unlikely to call an Orthodox Synod. Nor can any Man be ſo blind as to believe, that *Euſebius* and *Lucifer Calaritanus* were the Pope's Legates at this Council; for as to *Lucifer*, he was at that Time at *Antioch*, as appears by his ſending Two Deacons to *Alexandria* to ſubſcribe for him; and the Synodical Epiſtle of this Council to *Euſebius*, *Lucifer*, and others, plainly ſhews they were not preſent at this Council, and conſequently no Pope's Legates. They produce many Teſtimonies in their Defence out of Tracts which are ſpurious, and ſome out of the Acts of the Second *Nicene* Council; which being notoriouſly infamous, are not worth recounting. However, we may ſafely conclude with *Nazianzen*, *That* Athanaſius *in this Synod gave Laws to the whole World.* Baron. An. 362. Tom. 4. p. 66, 73. Lab. p. 809. Bin. p. 487. col. 1.

There were ſeveral Councils in this Pope's Time call'd in *France* by *Hilary* Biſhop of *Poictiers*, and the Catholick Faith ſettled in them; but no Pope mention'd; nor yet in that Orthodox Synod at *Alexandria*, wherein *Athanaſius* and his Suffragans preſented a Confeſſion of their Faith to *Jovian* the Emperor. Theſe were ſuch eminent Actions, that if the Biſhop of *Rome* had been any way concern'd in them, it had been impoſſible he

ſhould

ſhould have been every where omitted. But we may plainly from theſe infer, that *Liberius* at this Time either was a Heretick, or made but a mean Figure.

As to the Power of calling Councils, which the Biſhop of *Rome* claims, it's plain there's nothing in it beyond his own Diſtrict: Which we will make appear in a few Inſtances. Upon *Valentinian*'s Advancement to the Empire, the Eaſtern Biſhops petition him to call a Council; and he being buſy, told them they might call it where they pleas'd: Which Petition, and the Leave granted, ſhew, that the Right of Calling Councils was in him, as was alſo the Confirming them; as appears from the Biſhops ſending the Acts of this Council (at *Lampſacus*, *A. D.* 365.) to the Emperor *Valens* to be confirm'd. *Sozom. l.* 6. *c.* 7.

The Council of *Aquileia*, *A. D.* 381. in the Caſe of *Palladius* and other *Arians*, was abſolutely call'd by the Emperor; in which, *Valerian* Biſhop of *Aquileia*, and *Ambroſe* Biſhop of *Milan*, preſided. This being ſo undeniably plain, that it could admit of no Controverting, the Editors change their Note, and do not ſay in the Title as uſually, *under ſuch or ſuch a Pope*, but, *in the Time of* Damaſus. They might with as much Colour have ſaid, in the Time of St. *Ambroſe*, *Chryſoſtome*, or *Jerome*. Nay, *Damaſus* is not ſo much as named; nor had he any Repreſentative there, although this Council was call'd in *Italy*, and to confirm an Article of Faith. *Labbé*, *p.* 980. in the Acts of this Synod, like the reſt of the Editors, produces an Authority, which cuts the *Supremacy* down at once; for he brings in St. *Ambroſe* ſpeaking thus: *In former Times the Practice was, That the Eaſtern Biſhops had their Councils in the Eaſt, and Weſtern Biſhops in the Weſt. We in the Weſt held our Council at* Aquileia, *by the Command*

Command of the Emperor. Now what can be plainer, than that at this Time the Fathers of the Weſtern Church were altogether ignorant of that *Univerſal Power* which the *Roman Pontiffs* have ſince uſurp'd, or that the Emperor had the ſole Power of calling Councils?

The Notes ſay, *That the Second General Council of* Conſtantinople *was gather'd by the Authority of Pope* Damaſus, *and the Favour of* Theodoſius, *Bin. p.* 540. The Preface to this Council ſays, *it was call'd by the Emperor, not without* Damaſus's *Authority.* Baron. An. 380. p. 359, & 362. A pretty Way of blending the Imperial and Papal Authority! But this will not paſs; for this Council's Letter to *Theodoſius* ſays, *We were call'd together by your Epiſtle.* Lab. p. 946. Bin. p. 533. And when they were to have met at *Rome*, they affirm, *That* Damaſus *ſummon'd them to meet there by the Emperor's Letters.* Ep. ad Dam. Bin. 539. *Socrates* alſo, *l.* 5. *c.* 8. and *Sozomen*, *l.* 7. *c.* 7. expreſly ſay, *The Emperor call'd this Synod at* Conſtantinople: But the Preface and Notes confidently aver, *That they ſent their Acts to* Damaſus *to be approved, and he did confirm them.* Lab. p. 917, & 997. Bin. p. 521, & 541. Yet they tell us, That Pope *Gregory* above 200 Years after declared, *That the Church of* Rome *as yet neither had nor received the Acts of this Council:* A ſtrange Contradiction, that a Church ſhould confirm what it had not ſeen! Yet notwithſtanding theſe irreconcileable Aſſertions, both *Labbé*, *p.* 946. and *Binius*, *p.* 533. ſay, *That the Biſhops deſire* Theodoſius *by his pious Edict to confirm the Decrees of this Synod.*

[366.] The *Pontifical* differs in its own Account of Pope *Felix*; for in the Life of *Liberius* it ſaith, he died in Peace: But here in the Life of *Felix* it ſaith, he was martyr'd by *Conſtantius.* Their Accounts about him are ſo irreconcileable, that the

Editors themſelves can make nothing fairly out about him. We will paſs on to the Epiſtles aſcribed to him; which are the moſt groſs Forgeries hitherto compiled: And notwithſtanding they are ſo, and own'd as ſuch by *Labb. in marg. p* 844, *&* 849. they inſert them; nay, they have often quoted ſeveral of their forged Epiſtles and Decrees, at a Diſtance, for Authentick. The Firſt Epiſtle diſcovers it ſelf by the Title, *To the moſt Reverend Brethren*, Athanaſius, *&c.* Felix *Biſhop of the* Roman *City and Univerſal Church*, &c. This we are to ſwallow without examining; for if the Pope ſays, he is Univerſal Biſhop, Who dare queſtion it? This Epiſtle is dated in the Conſulſhip of *Agarius* and *Julian*; though none that ever wrote of the *Roman* Conſuls makes any Mention of *Agarius. Pet. Crab. Annot.* in this Epiſtle, *Tom.* 1. *p.* 363. Beſides, the latter Part of it is taken *verbatim* out of Pope *Felix* I. his Epiſtle to the *Gallican* Biſhops. But how great a Forgery ſoever it be, if it anſwers any End, it muſt be recurr'd to as an Authentick Regiſter. And therefore it is cited by *Canus* in his *Loc. Com. l.* 6. *c.* 4. *p.* 196. to prove, That the Hereticks had expung'd ſeveral Canons out of the *Nicene* Council. And by *Stapleton*, to prove, *That all the World ought to appeal to the Biſhop of* Rome.

The Title of the Second Epiſtle runs much like the former: Felix, *Pope of the Holy Univerſal Church*, &c. and has the ſame Tokens of Impoſture.

The Third Epiſtle, according to *Labb. in marg. p.* 857. is a plain Forgery, being ſtolen out of Pope *Martin* I. in his *Lateran* Council. And though *Binius* himſelf very often cites the Two Firſt Epiſtles, yet in his Notes on them he owns they are of no Credit. Strange Infatuation and Deluſion, to declare a Thing a Cheat, and at the ſame Time embrace it for Truth! *Bin. p.* 499. *col.* 1. *Lab. p.* 849.

[367.] Pope

[367.] Pope *Damaſus* enters the Papacy in Blood; for his Competitor *Urſicinus*, not ſtrong enough to reſiſt *Damaſus*'s Party, had many of his ſlain in a Church. 'Tis plain enough, Ambition, and not Religion, put them upon this; for the Luxury and Pomp of the Clergy at that Time made many good Men reflect on them. St. *Baſil* charges them with Pride; and St. *Hierome*, the great Friend of that Church, could not forbear accuſing them of the foreſaid Vices.

The Epiſtle of *Aurelius* Biſhop of *Carthage*, to *Damaſus*, and his Anſwer, are a couple of Forgeries: For *it is plain* (ſays *Baronius*) *by the Date of theſe Epiſtles, (which is in the Conſulſhip of* Gratian *and* Siricius) *that* Aurelius *was but a Deacon 15 Years after.* An. 377. n. 11. And yet, though this is ſo notorious and ſcandalous a Forgery, *Gratian* quotes it, to prove, *That it is Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt to break the Pontifical Canons.* 25 q. 1. violat.

His Two Epiſtles to *Paulinus* and the *Eaſtern* Biſhops are very ſuſpicious; and that to St. *Hierome* is an evident Forgery. His Epiſtle to the Biſhops of *Numidia*, about the *Chorepiſcopi*, or *Local-Biſhops*, is eaſy to be proved a Cheat for ſeveral Reaſons. Firſt, it is dated under the Conſuls *Libius* and *Theodoſius*, whom no Annaliſt ever took Notice of as ſuch. This is by *Duarenus*, *de Sac. Eccl. Min. &c. l.* 1. *c.* 9. accounted an empty vain Story; and truly, as *Cook* ſays, he might have call'd it childiſh and ridiculous: For what could be more ſilly and weak, than to tell the Biſhops, that the *Word* Epiſcoporum *implied the Plural Number, and that, according to the Grammarians, it was the Genitive Caſe Plural.* Happy Diſcovery, One and One make Two! But beſides, the latter Part of this Epiſtle is taken out of Pope *John* III.'s Epiſtle to the Biſhops of *Germany* and *Gaul*. They ſhew a ſtrong

Inclination to Knavery; but, like Thieves, have the ill Luck to be diſcovered.

Damaſus's Epiſtle to *Stephen* Archbiſhop of the Council of *Mauritania* (mark the Blunder) is ſuppoſititious, for this and other Reaſons; for it is dated in the Conſulſhip of *Flavius* and *Stilico*, who were not Conſuls till Twenty Years after *Damaſus*'s Death; and in the Body of it there is a forged Epiſtle of *Felix* quoted, which *Binius*, *p.* 499. owns to be ſpurious. *Stephen*'s Anſwer to it is of the ſame Leaven, which is plain by the Barbariſms in it. His Epiſtle to the Biſhops of *Italy* is falſe dated, and ſo are the reſt: And yet theſe are the Proofs that muſt ſupport their whimſical Doctrines; this is their Store-houſe of Teſtimony: But their Topicks are very unfortunate, to have no better Proof than Forgeries, and which are not only diſcovered by others, but ſuch as generally are own'd by themſelves; which Acknowledgment would carry ſome Face of Sincerity with it, if it were not yoak'd with an Aſſurance that would palm what they call Forgery upon the World for real Truths. Now though, as has been plainly prov'd, theſe Epiſtles are a Bundle of Lies and Nonſenſe, yet they are quoted for ſeveral Ends, (I ſuppoſe for which they were fram'd.) The Epiſtle of *Damaſus* to *Stephen* is cited by *Bellarmine*, *de Verbo Dei*, *l.* 3. *c.* 7. to prove, *That all Cauſes of Moment ought to be tried before the Apoſtolick Judge.* And the Anſwer of *Stephen*, by the ſame Author, *de Rom. Pont. l.* 2. *c.* 31. to prove, That the Biſhop of *Rome* ought to be call'd, *Father of Fathers, and Chief Pontiff.*

[385.] Pope *Siricius* was a Man of ſo mean a Character, that though he ſate 13 or 14 Years, yet both before and after his Election there is little can be found worth recounting of him. However,

over, like his Predeceſſor, he mounted the Papal Throne not without Trouble; for the ſame Competitor, *viz. Urſicinus*, ſtruggles with him for it, but loſes it. It's probable he might be one of thoſe *Illiterati* with which, about this Time, the *Roman* Church was plentifully ſtock'd, inſomuch that St. *Hierome* ſays, *Not one of them did pretend to Learning*, &c. *Hieron. Præf. ad Didym. de Spir. Sanct.* which is highly probable, if we conſider the Decretal Epiſtles of this Pope, which for their Nonſenſe, Impertinence, and hungry Style, ſeem to be the genuine Product of thoſe dull Times. The Firſt Epiſtle is ſevere againſt Marriage, which they endeavour to decry, but do it weakly; for they not only miſapply Texts of Scripture, but ſpeak prophanely of an Ordinance which God calls Holy, and oppoſe St. *Paul*, who ſays, *Heb.* 13. 4. *Marriage is honourable in all Men, not the Clergy excepted.*

The Second Epiſtle is ſuſpicious; but let its harſh and barbarous Style ſave it for once.

The Anſwer to this Epiſtle from the Council of *Milan* ſeems patch'd up out of ſeveral Authors, who wrote upon this Subject: But their making St. *Ambroſe* in it call the Pope *Brother*, (which looks forc'd, and againſt the Grain) and complimenting him as a *Great Maſter and Doctor*, does not look altogether like Truth; for St. *Ambroſe* made a much greater Figure than any Biſhop of *Rome* in his Time: And I cannot eaſily be perſuaded, that St. *Ambroſe* would call him a *Great Maſter and Doctor*, who at that Time, according to the beſt, nay, even the Editors own Accounts, and eſpecially the Epiſtles, was not only ignorant, but a Patron of Ignorance.

The Third Epiſtle for Style is like the former, which the Editors are very fond of, for in it the

Pope ſaith, *He hath the Care of all the Churches*; which can be meant no otherwiſe than of all the *Suburbicarian* Churches: For *Aurelius* Biſhop of *Carthage*, uſes the ſame Expreſſion, by which undoubtedly he meant only the Churches of his own Province, and not of the whole World, as *Binius* idly notes of *Siricius*.

The Fourth Epiſtle calls the Pope no more than *Primate*; which ſo ſowres *Labbé*, that he fairly confeſſes the Truth, and tells us it is ſtolen out of *Innocent*'s Epiſtle to *Victritius*; which he would ſcarcely have done, had not the Appellation ſeem'd to detract from the *Supremacy*.

About this Time was ſaid to be held the Second Council of *Arles*, which was but Provincial, and which condemned the Followers of *Photinus* and *Bonoſus*. The Title ſays, it was held in the Time of Pope *Siricius*; and ſo it was in the Time of thoſe it condemned. But for this there may be divers Reaſons: Firſt, without ſo much as naming the Biſhop of *Rome*, they reſolve all Eccleſiaſtical Matters to the Determination of their Metropolitan and his Synod. But, Secondly, perhaps they, and not without Reaſon, ſuſpected this Council, and therefore would not own it as held under the Pope. And truly there is one Thing very odd in it, and which renders it ſuſpicious; for in *Can.* 24. it is decreed, *That Accuſers of the Brethren ſhall be proceeded againſt according to the Council of* Nice. Now the Council of *Nice* mentions nothing of the Matter in the Genuine Canons. But they are reſolv'd they will make ſomething of the Matter to their Advantage; and therefore *Crabb*, and *Longus a Coriolano* from him, infer, That there were more than Twenty Canons made at that Council, becauſe this here quoted, and referring to the Council, is not among the Twenty. And here the Editors are

at

at their old Sport of raiſing Authority from what they had before condemned, and condemning what they had before approved: Particularly *Crabb*, (who I verily think is the honeſteſt of them;) for after he has rail'd againſt ſome Obſcurities in the following Canons, the 28th Canon mentioning the Council of *Vaſes*, he takes Opportunity to fall foul upon this Council, and detect it for ſpurious, by alledging, *That the Council of* Vaſes *was long after in the Time of Pope* Leo.

The Council of *Hippo* is by the Editors dated under *Siricius*, though it was held in *Afric* in a plenary Convention of Biſhops, and who ſeldom or never acknowledged the *Roman* Biſhops *Supremacy*: Beſides, the Canons made in it related to the Government of the *African* Church; whoſe Biſhops would not allow the Biſhop of *Rome* to have any Thing to do in it.

[398.] As for Pope *Anaſtaſius*, there had little been ſaid of him, if it had not been for his Friend St. *Hierome*, whom he ſo much obliged by condemning *Ruffinus*, a Diſciple of *Origen*, that St. *Hierome* thought he could do no leſs than mention him with Honour and Reſpect; which he knew very well how to do. There are Three Decretal Epiſtles publiſhed for this Pope. *Baronius* mentions only Two, which he detects of Forgery by the Date, which is 14 Years before *Anaſtaſius* was Pope, *Arcadius* and *Bauto* being Conſuls. But he ſays, the greateſt Part of it is taken out of *Leo the Great*'s Second Epiſtle to all the Biſhops of the Church, which diſcovers the Cheat. *Baron. An.* 402. *n.* 48. *Crabb* and *Labbé* are of the ſame Opinion. Yet *Bellarmine* quotes it to prove the *People ought to hear the Goſpel ſtanding*. De Miſſ. l. 2. c. 16. But there is yet another ſhameful Piece of Falſhood in this Epiſtle. It is directed to the Biſhops of *Germany*

and *Burgundy*; though *Burgundy* did not receive the Chriſtian Faith till the Year 413. However, notwithſtanding the palpable Detection of this Forgery, they will not quit it for the Sake of one Paſſage in it for the *Supremacy*, where *the* German *Biſhops are adviſed to ſend to him as the Head.*

The Second Epiſtle is alſo ſpurious, being dated 15 or 16 Years after *Anaſtaſius*'s Death, and ſtolen out of *Leo*'s 59th Epiſtle.

The Third may be genuine by the Style, which ſhews the Author of it to be but a mean Orator, and utterly ignorant of the Greek Tongue; for he declares, *He knew not who* Origen *was, nor what Opinions he held, till his Works were tranſlated into Latin.*

The Notes make a mighty Noiſe about nothing in the Fourth Council of *Carthage*; for though that Church never allowed the Pope to meddle by Way of Supreme in their Diſcipline, yet they will drag in a Pope to ſit at the Head of theſe Councils; though in this they cannot agree, whether it ſhall be under *Anaſtaſius* or *Zoſimus*. But by the Title it's plain it was call'd by *Aurelius* Biſhop of *Carthage*, in the Conſulſhip of *Honorius* and *Eutychianus*, where the Biſhops, without the Aſſiſtance of the Pope, made many excellent Canons: The 51ſt, 52d, and 53d of which are very ſevere againſt the great Numbers of idle, uſeleſs, vagrant, mendicant Monks, who in thoſe Times would have been compell'd to have found an honeſter and more reputable Way of maintaining themſelves than by begging.

The Hundredth Canon of this Council is moſt ſtrangely inverted. The Canon runs thus: *Let no Woman preſume to baptize.* But *Gratian, de Conſecrat. Diſtinct.* 4. *cap. Mulier.* hath corrupted it, by adding, *Except in Caſe of Neceſſity.* Which ſhews to what

Extremity they are brought, when they are forc'd to maintain their *Baptiſm by Women*, and other Lay-People, by ſuch Forgeries as theſe. *Peter Lombard*, *l.* 4. *ſent. diſt.* 6. *p.* 303. on the Sentences does the ſame: Which Two, as Dr. *James* truly ſays in his *Corruption of the Fathers*, &c. *p.* 207, 208. may be call'd *Brethren in Iniquity*; for they have foiſted in of their own Heads the Exception in this Canon, contrary to the Faith of the MSS. and Printed Copies.

The laſt Council of this Century was at *Alexandria*, and call'd by *Theophilus*, who found out and condemned the Errors of *Origen* long before *Anaſtaſius* knew any Thing of the Matter; and yet they have the Face to ſay it was under *Anaſtaſius*; though it was Two Years after this Council ſate, before St. *Hierome* could perſuade *Anaſtaſius* to condemn the Opinion of *Origen*, which this Council had firſt cenſur'd. *Baronius* deals very unfairly in the Caſe of the Decrees of this Synod being ſent by them to *Anaſtaſius*; for it is but upon meer Conjecture, ſaying, *That it is fit we ſhould believe this.* A very pretty Authority for *People to depend on!* But there is no Proof for this; for it is certain that *Theophilus* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, and Preſident of this Council, ſent them to *Epiphanius*, to *Chryſoſtome*, and *Hierome*; from which laſt it is moſt probable *Anaſtaſius* received them.

[399.] There was a Council call'd at *Carthage*, which the Editors, after their uſual Cuſtom, put under *Anaſtaſius*, as if ſummoned by his Authority. But he was ſo far from being any way concerned in it, that the Two Biſhops, *Epigonius* and *Vincentius*, that were delegated by this Council to the Emperor *Honorius* with a Petition, obtained their Requeſt of him without the Advice or Aſſiſtance of *Anaſtaſius*: And yet this was a Caſe in which

it

it would have highly behov'd all good Men, and eſpecially Biſhops, to give their helping Hand, for it related wholly to Church-Matters; ſo that Biſhops only ſhould judge offending Clergy: That Relicts of Idols ſhould be expell'd the Province of *Afric*: That Pagan Banquets and Theatrical Sports ſhould not be uſed on Sundays, or other Chriſtian Feſtivals, *&c.* Theſe were of ſuch Moment, that required every Body's Help; and yet we do not find *Anaſtaſius* moved the leaſt in it: Which perhaps may be the Reaſon why *Binius* makes ſo great a Conceſſion as to ſay, *That in the* African *Church none call'd a Council, or preſided in it, but the Biſhop of* Carthage. This, ſurely, could be for no other Intent than to excuſe *Anaſtaſius* for his Remiſneſs in this grand Affair.

[402.] Pope *Innocent* I. comes next upon the Stage, whom the Editors load with ſeveral forg'd Epiſtles. The Firſt of which to *Decentius* is cited by *Bellarmine*, *de Confirm. c.* 3. to prove Confirmation a Sacrament. By the ſame, *in l.* 2. *de Bon. Oper. in partic. c.* 18. to prove the *Sunday-Faſt*: And *in l.* 3. *de pœnit.* to prove Auricular Confeſſion. But *Cook p.* 105. takes this Epiſtle to task very handſomely. In this Epiſtle it's ſaid, *'Tis manifeſt, that no Body inſtituted Churches in* Italy, Spain, Gaul, Afric, Sicily, *or the interjacent Iſles, except thoſe whom the Bleſſed Apoſtle* Peter *and his Succeſſors appointed Prieſts.* This is ſo obvious and groſs a Forgery, that no Body can imagine *Innocent* the Author of it: For it is plain in the Acts of the Apoſtles, *c.* 28. that St. *Paul* taught in *Italy*. It is likewiſe plain from ſeveral of the *Greek* and *Latin* Fathers, that St. *Paul* taught in *Spain*. *Athanaſ. Ep. ad Dracont. Theodoret. in Ep. ad Philip.. c.* 1. *&c.*

Pope *Innocent*'s Epiſtle to *Victritius* is cited by *Bellarmine*, to prove *Cælibacy* to be an Apoſtolick Inſtitution,

ſtitution, and juſtly annex'd to *Holy Orders*, &c. But this Epiſtle to a Word is the ſame with that of Pope *Siricius* to the Biſhops of *Afric*, and therefore ought not to be laid at *Innocent*'s Door.

This Pope's Epiſtle to *Exuperius* is cited by *Bellarmine*, to prove the Books of *Tobit*, *Judith*, &c. to be canonical Scripture; and that Matrimony was a Tie indiſſolvable. But in it there are ſeveral Places of Scripture very impertinently quoted, wretchedly applied, and very unbecoming Pope *Innocent*. Nay, they pretend to quote Texts that never were in Being: For Inſtance; *The Prieſts took their annual Turn of Dwelling in the Temple, that they might be pure from all Filth whilſt they attended the Divine Myſteries.* But there is no ſuch Text or Paſſage in the Bible. What impious Wretches are theſe, that dare profane theſe Holy Writings, by intruding their own vile Inventions and lewd Contaminations among them? Again, we find it thus written in the Goſpel: *He that putteth away his Wife, and marrieth another, committeth Adultery; and he that marrieth her that is put away committeth Adultery.* But this is falſe, for the Text is attended with an Exception; *He that putteth away his Wife, except for Fornication.* In this Epiſtle they produce ſome Texts to prove, *That they that live with their Wives ought not to be admitted to miniſter at the Altar.* The firſt is from *Levit.* 11. *Be ye holy, as I am holy.* The next is that of St. *Paul* to *Titus*, *c.* 1. *To the pure all things are pure, but to the defiled and unbelieving nothing is pure.* Surely, People may be chaſt in Marriage, and the *Bed undefiled*, or elſe St. *Paul* was very much miſtaken when he ſaid ſo; for would he have call'd it honourable, if he had not believ'd it ſo? *Heb.* 13. 4. But Forgery with theſe People is above genuine Truth; and the infallible Succeſſor of St. *Peter* is to be believed before his Predeceſſor. What

ſtrange

ſtrange Deluſion do People labour under, who will ſuffer themſelves to be thus impos'd on? Surely, without Injury or Affront to a Sacred Text, theſe People may be ſaid ſtill to walk in Darkneſs, that can blindly ſwallow ſuch groſs Falſhood.

The Epiſtle to the Council of *Carthage*, which is the 25th, is quoted by *Bellarmine*, *de Lib. Arb. l.* 3. *c.* 25. to prove Free-will. By *Canus*, *Loc. Com. l.* 6. *c.* 4, & 8. to prove, *That the Apoſtolick See is to be on all extraordinary Occaſions conſulted*; and, *That the Biſhop of* Rome *is St.* Peter's *Succeſſor*. But this Epiſtle, *Eraſmus*, in his *Cenſur. in Ep.* 91. *inter Ep. Aug.* ſays, *wants both the Style and Genius of ſo great a Prelate.*

The 26th Epiſtle, to the Council of *Miletum* in *Afric*, is quoted by *Bellarmine* again to prove Free-will; and that young Children dying unbaptized were damn'd. And this Epiſtle is undoubtedly his to whom it is aſcrib'd, ſays *Bellarmine*, *de amiſſ. grat. l.* 6. *c.* 2. & *de grat. l.* 5. *c.* 26. But, ſoft and fair! for *Eraſmus*, who ſet a Mark upon the former Epiſtle, does not let this paſs uncorrected; for he ſays 'tis done by the ſame Hand; and not without Reaſon, for it is dated with the Conſuls *Honorius* and *Conſtantius*; when, according to *Marianus*, *Onuphrius*, and others, *Innocent* died the Year before, when *Theodoſius* and *Palladius* were Conſuls.

There is an Epiſtle extant under the Name of *Innocent* to the Emperor *Arcadius*, which, as notorious a Forgery as it is, is quoted by *Alan*, *Contr. Inſtit. Brit. c.*5. and *Bellarmine*, *de Rom. Pont. c.*19. *l.*2. to prove, That Pope *Innocent* excommunicated *Arcadius* and his Wife *Eudoxia*. This, by the way, is to ſhew their Supremacy over Kings, (not but that Kings have too often incurr'd and deſerv'd the Cenſure of the Church.) But the Firſt that ever took Notice of this, was one *Nicephorus Caliſtus*, *Hiſt. l.* 13. *c.* 34.

c. 34. a modern Writer, and, as his Adverſaries call him, a moſt abominable Lyar. But the very Epiſtle betrays it ſelf; for it is ſaid in it, that *Eudoxia* was alive after the Death of *John Chryſoſtome*; whereas 'tis plain from *Socrates*, *l.* 6. *c.* 19, 20, 21. and *Sozomen*, *l.* 8. *c* 27, 28. that *Eudoxia* died three Years before *Chryſoſtome*, which our Biſhop *Bilſon* likewiſe well remembers, *de Primat. Regio*, *par.* 1. *Venericus Vercellenſis*, ſpeaking of this Matter, ſays, *It is uncertain whence this Epiſtle is taken; but it is moſt certain, that it is not to be found among the Acts of the Popes, where Pope* Innocent's *are particularly recorded, nor in the Book of his Decrees, nor in the Tripartite Hiſtory, where more is to be found of the Sentence of Depoſition than elſewhere. De Unitate Eccleſ. conſerv. l.* 2.

[417.] The *Pontifical*, as it had done before in others, ſo in the Life of Pope *Zoſimus*, lays a Foundation for ſeveral Fictions. For from hence they pretend the Uſe of the *Pall*, and that ridiculous Cuſtom of conſecrating the *Paſchal* Wax Taper. *Binius*, in his Notes upon the Life of this Pope, highly applauds him for the Sentence of Excommunication pronounced againſt *Celeſtius* the Heretick. But yet *Binius*'s Notes upon the Third Epiſtle of *Zoſimus*, ſeem to condemn the ſevere Diſcipline of the *African* Church againſt Hereticks, *Labb. T.* 2. *p.* 1560. owning that *Celeſtius* had been condemned by the *African* Biſhops before, but very unfairly infer from thence, that he had appealed to the *Apoſtolick* See for Juſtice. But what greater Blot could be caſt upon the *Roman* Church, and the *Infallibility* of the *Supream Judge*, than that he ſhould attempt the Reconciliation of a Heretick ſynodically condemned by another Church? Which is plain from the foreſaid Notes, and which the Canons of ſeveral ancient Councils had before forbid. This is plain from a Council held at *Carthage*,

thage, A. D. 418. in which they again condemn'd the Hereſy of *Pelagius* and *Celeſtius*, making many excellent Canons againſt ſuch heretical Opinions, and which they ſent to Pope *Zoſimus* (not to be confirm'd by him) with Letters, wherein they ſharply reprove him for his Credulity and Eaſineſs in the Reconciliation of *Celeſtius*. And truly his Eaſineſs may proceed from his Ignorance, which the foreſaid Notes ſeem to confirm in theſe Words: Celeſtius, *the better to conceal his Hereſy, drew up a Confeſſion of his Faith ſo artfully, that* Zoſimus *could not avoid being impoſed upon by him Ibid.* And *Labbé*, in his Obſervation annex'd to theſe Notes, ingenuouſly confeſſes, *That there are many Inſtances in St.* Auguſtine, *which plainly ſhew how Pope* Zoſimus *was over-reach'd by that cunning Heretick* Celeſtius. *Ibid.*

This Pope ſat one Year and two Months, in which Time he is ſaid to have written 13 Epiſtles; which indeed, contrary to the former, are dated under Eight Conſuls. But there are many Things which ſmell ſtrong of Forgery in them. The Firſt Epiſtle to *Heſychius*, deſiring a Copy of the Decrees, ſpeaks loftily of the Authority of the *Roman* See, *which alone can ſupply the Defects of Power in other Biſhops.* The Third Epiſtle is worth obſerving, for *Zoſimus* declares *Celeſtius a good Catholick, and that he had from the Beginning a peculiar Reſpect for the See of* Rome. Very likely truly! Conſidering the Trick he had put upon the *Infallible* Judge. In his Fourth Epiſtle *Zoſimus* writes in Favour of *Pelagius*, ſaying, *he ſeem'd to be a Catholick.* Upon which *Binius* thus notes: Pelagius *and* Celeſtius, *both ting'd with the ſame Hereſy, uſed the ſame ſubtil Way of deceiving the Apoſtolick See. Labb. T.* 2. *p.* 1563.

In the Margin to the Fifth Epiſtle of this Pope, *Labbé* obſerves, That the ancient Copy in the *Palatine*

latine Library makes this Epiſtle to be Pope *Sylveſter's*, and calls it an *Apoſtolick* Conſtitution. But this Jargon is no new Thing among the Editors and Collectors of the Councils, who make no Scruple whom they father their Forgeries upon, ſo they do but anſwer ſome End.

The Tenth Epiſtle to the Council of *Carthage* is very improbable; for it is not likely the Pope ſhould ſo ſtrenuouſly aſſert the Power of the *Apoſtolick* See, which at this very Time not only ſlighted him, but in their Letters chid him ſeverely for his Eaſineſs in being reconciled ſo haſtily to Hereticks. *Vid. ſupra.*

The 13th Epiſtle is a downright Forgery, talking big of Supremacy, *&c.* to *Greek* Biſhops, who never own'd any Submiſſion to the See of *Rome.* But *Labbé*, in the Margin to this Epiſtle, *To.* 2. *p.* 1574. puts the Matter out of Diſpute in theſe Words, *The Difference of Style makes this Epiſtle look ſuſpicious; and beſides, it is faulty in ſeveral Places.*

[418.] *Boniface* I. is the next in the Catalogue of the *Roman* Biſhops; and notwithſtanding the Infallibility of the Papal Chair, *Eulalius* the Archdeacon was his Competitor and Antipope; which occaſioned a Schiſm, and no ſmall Diſturbance in the *Roman* Church. The Year following, at the Command of the Emperor *Honorius*, a Council was called at *Ravenna*, in which the Controverſy between *Boniface* and *Eulalius* was diſcuſs'd. From whence it is plain the Emperors were the Perſons who had the Power of calling Councils to determine Matters of great Moment. This *Boniface's* Firſt Epiſtle to the Emperor confirms, (which, together with the Anſwer, look like genuine) for it is all the Way ſupplicatory, begging the Emperor's Aid againſt irregular Elections; to which the Emperor gave an Anſwer becoming his Piety. And here

here it may be obſerved, That where we meet with genuine Epiſtles, they carry in them a quite different Air and Strain of Humility than the forg'd ones do. Not only this Epiſtle of *Boniface*'s to the Emperor, but all his other Epiſtles to his Brother Biſhops, are written in a meek Style; no bullying, or aſſerting the Supremacy of the *Roman* Pontiff, but piouſly exhorting to *Brotherly Love and Chriſtian Charity*.

[423.] To put an End to the old Controverſy, the *African* Biſhops write to *Celeſtine*, now Biſhop of *Rome*, defending the Rights of their Church againſt all Appeals to the *Papal* See, (which they call in plain Words, *The impious Refuge of the Clergy*) aud ſharply reprehend the *Roman* Prelates for their arrogant Preſumption in claiming more Power in the Church of Chriſt than of Right belonged to them. *Celeſtine*, about the ſame Time, compliments *Neſtorius* upon his Promotion to the See of *Conſtantinople*, who at that Time did but pretend to be a Catholick. But this *Celeſtine*'s *infallible Opticks* could not ſee into. And therefore *Neſtorius*, well knowing the Advantage of gaining over to his Party the Biſhop of the Firſt See, and finding the blind Side of the *Infallible Judge*, attacks him with ſuch ſpecious Arguments and Perſwaſions, that if he had not been kept upright by his Neighbours, who knew more of the Matter than himſelf, he might, as ſeveral of his Infallible Predeceſſors, have turn'd Heretick, and *brought the Catholick Church in Danger*, as the Editors ſay by *Liberius*, upon his frequent Apoſtatizing.

But *Celeſtine* being inform'd by *Cyril*, of *Neſtorius*'s Treachery, *A. D.* 430. at *Rome*, calls a Council, in which he condemns his old Friend *Neſtorius*'s Hereſy, and by Letters threatens to excommuni-

cate

cate him from the Church of *Rome*, unleſs within Ten Days he openly renounc'd his Error.

[431.] *Celeſtine* ſends Legates to the Council of *Epheſus*, to puſh on the Condemnation of *Neſtorius*; and the Year after he congratulates the Fathers at *Epheſus* for their Proceedings againſt *Neſtorius*; and at the ſame Time writes communicatory Letters to *Maximian*, who was choſen in *Neſtorius*'s Room.

As for the Epiſtles which are extant in this Pope's Name, they are, according to the Editors, Fourteen in Number, *Labb. T.* 2. *p.* 1611. whereof Five are in *Greek*, among the Acts of the Council of *Epheſus*. The Firſt Epiſtle is cited by *Bellarmine* for *Exorciſm in Baptiſm*, *de Bapt. c.* 25. *For Free-Will in Morals*, *de Grat & lib. Arb. l.* 5. *c.* 26. *And for the Merit of Works*, *de Juſtif. l.* 5. *c.* 4. But ſays *Crab*, in the Margin to the Notes on this Epiſtle, *The laſt Eleven Chapters of this Epiſtle ſeem to be compoſed by ſome other Hand than* Celeſtine's. And to be plain, there is great Reaſon to think ſome Body like *Bellarmine* had a Hand in it; for the very Teſtimonies which he produces are here to be found. But that there is a Cheat is moſt certain, nor is it much Matter who was the Author of it; let 'em take it among 'em.

Nicephorus, *l.* 14. *c.* 39. pretends to recollect Three other Epiſtles; *viz.* to *Cyril*, *John* of *Antiochia*, and *Rufus* of *Theſſalonica*, in which he ſeems to approve of the Tranſlation of *Proclus* from the See of *Cyzicene* to that of *Conſtantinople*. But this could not be, for this Tranſlation of *Proclus* was not till two Years after the Death of *Celeſtine*. From whence we may fairly conclude theſe Epiſtles are not genuine. Nor is that Book *de Secretis*, which is aſcrib'd to *Celeſtine*, of better Reputation, of which *Nicephorus*, in the Place afore-cited, adds two Frag-

ments. But this was certainly patch'd up by ſome Friend of the Pontificate about the Time of the Controverſies between the *Greek* and *Roman* Churches.

[432.] *Sixtus* the Third, before he was choſen Pope, was accuſed of *Pelagianiſm*, but falſly; which unjuſt Calumny made him a bitter Enemy to that Hereſy, and cauſed him to write a Book againſt it. After he was Pope, he did many good and publick Acts; ſuch as, the Defence of the Council of *Epheſus*, his reconciling the *Eaſtern* Church and the *Egyptians*, which he left no Means unattempted to perfect; his Chriſtian Care by Letters to *Neſtorius*, then in Baniſhment in the Monaſtery of *Euprepius*, inviting him to return to the Catholick Faith; and at the End of his *Pontificate*, his truly Chriſtian Valour in expelling *Julian* and other Ringleaders of the *Neſtorian* Hereſy from the Communion of the Church. Now, any Man would reaſonably ſuppoſe, that the great Character of this good Man, and his pious Acts, were Applauſe enough to be left to Poſterity. But perhaps they think, the Piety of this Pope would ſcreen Abundance of Follies in others, or perhaps better carry on a Cheat. This is indeed a Sort of murdering the Dead, and ſtigmatizing their Reputation as long as Time ſhall endure. But this will be as long as there are ſuch Men in the World. There is an Epiſtle under this Pope's Name to the *Eaſtern* Biſhops, which is cited by *Bellarmine*, *de Concil. l.* 1. *c.* 12. to prove, That *Councils ought to be called by none but the Biſhop of* Rome. But this Epiſtle is ſpurious, for Two Reaſons; Firſt, becauſe the greateſt Part of it is taken out of *Fabian*'s Epiſtle to *Hilarius*, which hath already been proved ſuppoſititious. Secondly, becauſe it is dated in the Conſulſhip of *Valentinian* and *Florentius*

rentius, who never were Conſuls all the Time of *Sixtus* the Third.

The Acts of *Sixtus* the Third, which are cited by *Bellarmine*, to prove, That the Biſhop of *Rome* might depoſe *Polychronius* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, are fictitious, *which any Man of common Prudence may ſee by the Date of the Conſuls, the Name of the Perſon accuſed, and other Things deſcrib'd in theſe Acts*, ſays *Binius*, and much more to the ſame Purpoſe, which he takes out of *Baronius*, *An.* 433. *n.* 36, 37, and 38. Thus, to ſerve particular Ends, good Popes muſt be made the Authors of bad Things; and wicked Popes, tho' Hereticks, muſt appear Saints in ſome forged Epiſtle or Treatiſe.

[440.] *Leo* I. ſirnamed the Great, ſucceeded Pope *Sixtus* III. about whom the *Pontifical* and other Authors cannot agree: The *Pontifical* (which is ſeldom right) calls him a *Tuſcan*, others a *Roman*. But this is a ſmall Matter with them. Before *Leo* was choſen Pope, (and truly ſome Time after) he behaved himſelf ſo, as firſt to deſerve, and after become that great Poſt in which he was inveſted. He was not only a ſtrenuous Champion againſt the *Neſtorian* Hereticks before he was Pope, but after; and not only acted againſt them in Perſon, but incited others; as appears by *Caſſian*'s Epiſtle to him, who wrote VII. Books *de Incarnatione Dei*, in Anſwer to the *Neſtorians*, and dedicated them to *Leo*, at that Time only a Deacon. He likewiſe, by Order of Pope *Sixtus* III. undertook the reconciling the two Generals *Etius* and *Albinus*, which he happily performed. During which Legation, *Sixtus* dies, and *Leo* is choſen in his Room by a general Conſent. This was a Time when both Church and State had put on a moſt melancholy Aſpect. For the Incurſions of barbarous Nations, and the Deluge of *Neſtorian*, *Pelagian*, and *Arian* Hereticks,

had in a Manner defac'd Religion and Humanity. Notwithſtanding which, *Leo* undauntedly purſues his high Office, being wanting in nothing that might be for the Honour or Service of the Church. The firſt Inſtance of his Zeal was ſhewn againſt the *Manichees*, who coming from *Afric*, skulk'd at *Rome* under Colour of Catholicks, and at the Communion would take the *Bread*, but not the *Cup*. [By the Way, it is worth obſerving, That the Cup not being denied in thoſe Times to the Laity, the denying it now looks like an ugly Innovation.] This *Leo* warn'd the People of, as appears in his 4th Sermon upon Lent, *p.* 217. wherein he calls the *Manichees*'s declining the Cup (which he calls in this Sermon the Blood of our Redemption) a *Sacrilegious Hypocriſy*, which ought to be expell'd the Church. It's plain therefore, that at this Time the Faithful received the Euchariſt in both Kinds, and that they who did otherwiſe, were branded with the infamous Note of Hereſy. *Cav. Hiſt. Lit.* 342.

Thus far I think no *Romaniſt* but will commend, rather than blame me, for any Thing I have ſaid of this Pope. And truly, as may be ſaid of many others, abſtract the Pope from the Man, we ſhall find him afterwards doing very good Things. But hitherto, I am ſure, I have made *Leo* an honeſter Man than the Editors do, who by palming their ridiculous Fables upon him, vilify and deſtroy his Character.

About the Year 448, *Eutyches* the Heretick, not as yet known to be ſuch in the *Weſt*, by Letters crept into Favour with *Leo*. Upon which *Leo* wrote both to the Emperor and to *Flavian* in his Behalf; (another Rub upon the Infallibility) by whom being better inform'd, he condemned the Heretick, and wrote a long and learned Epiſtle to *Flavian* againſt *Eutyches* and his Errors. The Year following, he

he ſent his Legates to the Council at *Epheſus* called *Latrocinale*; from whence, as ſoon as he underſtood that all Things were carried there by Fraud and Violence in Favour of *Eutyches*, by *Dioſcorus*, he calls a Synod at *Rome*, in which he reſcinds the Acts of the Council of *Epheſus*, and condemns *Eutyches*. In return for which, *Dioſcorus*, in Conjunction with Ten *Metropolitans*, excommunicates *Leo*. To appeaſe theſe Tumults, which daily increas'd, a General Council is reſolv'd on, which *Leo* labour'd, both with the Emperor and Empreſs, to have in *Italy*; but could not obtain it: Wherefore it was called at *Chalcedon*, *A. D.* 451. whether *Leo* ſent *Paſchaſianus* and *Lucentius*, Biſhops, and *Boniface*, Presbyter, his Legates; who ſtrove with all their Might to have *Leo*'s Epiſtle to *Flavian*, written two Years before, inſerted in the Form of Faith defin'd in this Council. But the Fathers anſwer'd, They were ready to confirm the foreſaid Epiſtle by their Subſcription, but could not admit it to be interwoven with the Synodical Decrees. And when the Legates inſiſted ſtill upon their Demand, and that the Emperor urg'd the ſame, the Biſhops unanimouſly cried, *They who contradict this, let them go to* Rome. From this it plainly appears, that *Leo* had a Deſign upon this Synod, and inſtead of acting the good Man, he play'd the Part of the cunning One, for by getting his Letter to *Flavian* recorded among the Acts of this Council, they ſhould ſeem to receive their Sanction from him. To prevent which, the Fathers inſiſt upon the Rights of Councils; and, though the Emperor ſeemed to favour the Pope's Intereſt in this Thing, (not ſuſpecting the Biſhop of *Rome*'s Deſign, which ſoon after ſhew'd it ſelf) yet they reſolutely declare againſt any ſuch Inſinuation, and will allow nothing but their own Decrees to be recorded. So jealous

were they of the Encroachments of the *Roman* Prelates; which they, no Doubt, had Reaſon at that Time to ſuſpect, not only from the aforeſaid exorbitant Demand, but from other Paſſages, which muſt needs give them Hints of theſe clandeſtine Deſigns, which ſoon after appeared. For when they came to compoſe the Canons, and in the 28th Canon decreed, That the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* ſhould enjoy the ſame Privileges and Honours which the Biſhop of *Rome* did, the Legates could not contain themſelves, but openly declared, *It was a Violation of the* Nicene *Canons, and that they could not conſent to any Thing that derogated from the Honour of the Church of* Rome, *or that diminiſh'd the Power of the* Apoſtolick *See, and that this was expreſly commanded them by* Leo *in their Deputation.* Here's the Secret out, their Errand was to enlarge the Pontificate, and to loſe nothing of its Attributes or Prerogative. Nevertheleſs, the Council proceeded, and paſs'd this and the reſt of the Canons, the Emperor's Deputies aſſenting to and confirming them. Which *Leo* hearing, it put him ſo out of Temper, that he could not forbear Railing; but particularly at *Anatolius* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, whom he treats very ſcurvily, and was never after Friends with. However he ſubſcrib'd to the Confeſſion of Faith here agreed upon, but would not allow the foreſaid Decree.

It is worth obſerving, That the laſt Three Canons of this Council, as repugnant to the Practice of the Court and Church of *Rome*, are rejected by moſt of the Editors, particularly *Crabb. Longus a Cor. Joan. Antioch. Dionyſ. Exiguus*, and *Cabbaſutius*, who ſtrenuouſly decries their Validity.

Amongſt the great Number of Epiſtles aſcrib'd to this Pope, that which is called the 69th, and ſaid to be written to *Victurius* and *Euſtochius*, is falſly

attributed to *Leo*. This *Labbé* plainly makes appear from *Sirmondus*'s Notes. *The Name of* Leo, ſays he, *hath induc'd moſt Men to believe that it was Pope* Leo's, *whereas indeed it was written by* Leo Biturienſis.

[461.] Pope *Hilarius* comes next. He, with Biſhop *Julian*, and *Renatus*, Presbyter, were Legates from *Leo* to the Council of *Epheſus* in 449. His Firſt Epiſtle, which he wrote when he was only Deacon of the Church of *Rome* to the Empreſs *Pulcheria*, does ill agree with thoſe he wrote afterwards to the Biſhops of *Arragon*; for in that to *Pulcheria*, he complains of the unjuſt Sentence againſt *Flavian*; and tho' he was the Pope's Repreſentative in that Council, yet he does not here, as in thoſe to the Biſhops aforeſaid, dare to aſſert the *Infallibility* and *Supremacy*.

[467.] The Papacy of *Simplicius* is infamous for the malicious Perſecution of *Acacius* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, who, becauſe he would not recede from his Right of equal Power and Honour, decreed by the Council of *Chalcedon*, ſuffered much from *Simplicius*.

The Notes on *Simplicius*'s Firſt Epiſtle, tell a moſt notorious Untruth, and which the meaneſt Capacity is able to contradict, that ever knew any Thing of Sacred Antiquity. After *Simplicius* had made *Zeno* Biſhop of *Sevil* Apoſtolick Vicar, the Notes add, *It is to be obſerv'd, that as in this Place* Zeno *was conſtituted Vicar of the* Spaniſh *Churches, ſo* Acacius *Biſhop of* Conſtantinople *was delegated to govern the* Eaſtern *Churches*. It is hardly to be believed, that one Patriarch ſhould accept of a Deputation from another; eſpecially, when in a General Council, confirm'd by the Emperor, they were both declared equal; but it is more incredible, if we conſider the foreſaid Difference between

these two Patriarchs, and which on the Pope's Side was for Supremacy only. But this is like *Binius*, who seldom speaks a true Thing, or does a fair One.

[483.] Pope *Felix* succeeds *Simplicius* in his Papacy, and Malice too; for at the Complaint of one *Talaia*, he sent Legates to *Constantinople* in the Case of *Acacius*, which Legation drop'd to nothing; but the next Year calling a Synod at *Rome*, he condemns and excommunicates *Acacius*; but defers the Publication of the Sentence for some Time; till fresh Troubles breaking out upon the Account of *Acacius*'s deposing *Calendion* of *Antioch*, the latter End of the same Year he calls another Synod at *Rome*, and repeats the Sentence; which *Acacius*, so lightly valued, that he expung'd *Felix*'s Name out of the *Dyptichs*, or Sacred *Register of the Church*, according to *Nicephorus*, *l.* 16. *c.* 17.

The First Epistle of this Pope is quoted by *Canus*, *Loc. Com. p.* 196. to prove, That the Hereticks expung'd several Canons out of the Council of *Nice*. And by *Stapleton*, *Relect. Controv.* 3. *q.* 7. to prove, That all Appeals ought to be made to the See of *Rome*. But this Epistle is dated under the Consulship of *Agarius* and *Julian*, who are not mentioned by any Chronologer whatever. Besides, as *Peter Crab* observes in his Annotation on this Epistle, *Tom.* 1. *p.* 362. the latter Part of this Epistle is taken *verbatim* out of the Epistle of Pope *Felix* I. to the Bishops of *Gaul*.

[492.] *Gelasius*, an *African* by Nation, and a very learned Man, is this Year advanc'd to the Pontifical Chair; and is immediately complimented by *Euphemius* with communicatory Orthodox Letters, which *Gelasius* owns, but declines an Answer, till *Euphemius* had expung'd *Acacius*'s Name out of the *Dyptichs*; which *Euphemius* positively refuses,

fuſes, proteſting againſt the unjuſt Sentence pronounc'd againſt *Acacius*. *Gelaſius* perſiſts in the Defence of his Predeceſſor's Proceedings, which he endeavours to defend by many and long Epiſtles to *Euphemius*, and the Emperor *Anaſtaſius*, and as long as he lived, denied Communion with *Euphemius* and all his Adherents.

Thus from *Leo*, who was the firſt Pretender to or Inſinuator of the *Supremacy*, the ſucceeding Biſhops of *Rome* carry on the Claim of an Univerſal Power; which in that very Time the *Greek* and *African* Churches were far from acknowledging.

In this Pontificate, the *Manichees* in *Rome* skreen'd themſelves under the Maſk of *Catholiciſm*; but, to give this Pope his Due, he ſoon diſcovered and routed them; for, by a Decree, he declared thoſe Perſons Hereticks who did not communicate in both Kinds. Upon which he condemn'd and baniſh'd them the City. Nor did he ſhew himſelf leſs ſevere againſt the *Pelagians* and *Eutychians*, as Occaſion offer'd, either in Writing or Authority. What was ſaid of *Leo the Great*, may truly be ſaid of this Prelate, That they were pious, learned, eloquent, prudent, vigilant in their paſtoral Care, zealous againſt Hereticks, ſteady in Point of Faith, ſtrenuous Aſſerters of the Pontificate, as appears in *Leo* againſt the General Council of *Chalcedon*, and in both in the Caſe of *Acacius*, whoſe Right of equal Honour and Power was the ſame with the Biſhops of *Rome*, as founded upon the ſame Authority.

That moſt famous Decree, ſaid to be this Pope's, about the Canonical Books of Scripture, and which is almoſt in every Hand, cannot be his for ſeveral Reaſons, ſays Doctor *Cave*, *Par.* 1. *p.* 374. 1. The ancient Books aſcrib'd it to no certain Author; for *Baluzius*, in his Notes upon *Gratian*, *p.* 44.

tells

tells us, It is by ſome attributed to *Damaſus*, by ſome to *Gelaſius*, and by others to *Hormiſda*; which is a certain Sign that the Author of it is unknown. 2. There are Books cited in this Decree, *A. D.* 494. either not yet written, or never heard of. 3. There are many Abſurdities and Inconſiſtencies in it, unbecoming the Judgment of *Gelaſius*, or the Synod. 4. It condemns the Apoſtolick Canons, which *Dionyſius Exiguus*, who greatly valued *Gelaſius*'s Memory, quickly after turn'd into *Latin*, without any Scruple of their Authority, and which the Church of *Rome* received and practiſed as a moſt exact Rule for Eccleſiaſtick Diſcipline; which She would never have done, had they been rejected or condemned by *Gelaſius*. To confirm which, Biſhop *Pearſon*, in his Vindication of *Ignatius*, *par.* 1. *c.* 4. ſhews us, That *Gelaſius* admitted the Apoſtolick Canons, and in his Decretal Epiſtles ſeems to approve the Uſe of them. 5. The Author of this Decree pretends to agree with St. *Hierome* in all Things, *We are of the ſame Opinion with St.* Hierome. But he is diametrically oppoſite to St. *Hierome*, about the Canon of Scripture, calling *Tertullian*, *Paſtor*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *&c.* Apocryphal, and forbidding them to be read by Catholicks, which Authors he highly applauds, and recommends to be read. Finally, no Body before the Year 840 mentions any Thing of this Decree, either in Hiſtory or Controverſy. And it is ſcarcely to be ſuppos'd, That *Dyonyſius Exiguus*, who lived much about that Time, was a great Admirer of this Pope, and not long after his Death collected the Decrees of the *Roman* Prelates, and amongſt theſe the Decrees of *Gelaſius*, bearing Date the ſame Year, ſhould omit ſuch a Decree as this.

Now

Now this Decree being plainly proved ſuppoſitious, I cannot imagine for what End the Author of it ſhould impoſe it upon the World, except, by Way of Inſinuation, to introduce an unlimited Power of Directing, Contradicting, Doing, Undoing, and at the ſame Time oblige Mankind to think and believe, That this *Infallible Judge* cannot err, tho' his Actions are meer Frenzy, and his Decrees a Series of Contrarieties.

But when any Thing, tho' never ſo bright and valuable, appears under the Name of any Pope, if it interferes with their modern Principles and Practice, down it muſt, rather than the *Epheſians* loſe their *Great Diana*. A very foul Inſtance of this we have in that incomparable Treatiſe of this Pope's *againſt Eutyches* and *Neſtorius, concerning the Two Nature's of Chriſt. Labb. T.* 4. *p.* 1157, *&c.* In which Treatiſe, *Gelaſius* produces the ſtrongeſt Argument againſt the *Tranſubſtantiating the Euchariſtical Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Chriſt*, that may be. For which Reaſon, *Baronius, Bellarmine, Gregory de Valentia, Suarez*, and others, will not allow this Treatiſe to be Pope *Gelaſius*'s; but ſome aſcribe it to *Gelaſius Cyzizenus*, others to *Gelaſius* of *Cæſarea*: But Truth will prevail. *Gennadius, de Script. c.* 94. mentions it. *Fulgentius, l. de* 5 *Queſtion. apud Ferrandum diac. c.* 18. and Pope *John* II. in his Epiſtle to *Avicenus*, quotes this very Treatiſe of *Gelaſius*; and *Anaſtaſius*, the Abbot and Librarian at *Rome*, towards the End of the Ninth Century, aſcribes this Book to *Gelaſius*. *Lab. T.* 4. *p.* 1054. *Lib. Pont. in Vit. Gelaſ.* Nay, ſo great is the Force of Truth, that *Labbé, T.* 1. *p.* 342. *Diſſert. de Script. Eccleſ.* offers very good Reaſons for this Book's being *Gelaſius*'s. I muſt confeſs, I ſhould have ſome Charity for ſeveral of the *Roman* Editors, for the Sake of their ingenuous Dealing in Caſes of Forgery, provided they

they did not afterwards make that baſe Uſe of them, to ſerve a Turn in confirming one Forgery by another. I ſhould allow their Way of expoſing Cheats to publick View, with their honeſt marginal Hints, to caution the unwary Reader againſt Frauds. Among theſe I reckon *Peter Crab*, one of the honeſteſt; *Labbé* and *Caſſart* next; and *Baronius* after them: But not thoſe abominable Paraſites of the *Pontificate*, *Bellarmine*, hot-headed *Binius*, fulſome, impertinent and trifling *Longus a Coriolano*. But when I find them perverting the Good, and diſowning the Truth and genuine Works of their moſt learned and pious Biſhops, I cannot but with Horror look upon them as a Generation of Vipers, who would gnaw their Way through the Bowels of their Mother the Church, and her Primitive Doctrines, to ſupport their ambitious Practices; and by Impoſtures perſuade the World, that their late Whimſies and Fopperies were the Diſcipline of the earlieſt Times of Chriſtianity.

[496.] *Anaſtaſius* is no ſooner promoted to the Papal Dignity, but intereſts himſelf in the old Quarrel between *Leo* and *Acacius*, inſiſting to have his Name expung'd the *Diptychs*; but he might as well have kept his Legates at home, for the Emperor *Anaſtaſius* aſſures his Nameſake the Pope, that he will reſolutely defend the Cauſe of *Acacius*. *Vid. Valeſ. notas in Theodori Lectoris collect. l. 2. p. 560.* In the Midſt of which Pope *Anaſtaſius* dies; upon which a Schiſm commences, and an Antipope ariſes, by the Name of *Laurentius*. But before we leave *Anaſtaſius*, let us ſee what the *Pontifical* ſays of him: Which, with *Platina*, (who is upon Occaſion much beholden to this Book) tells us, *'Tis plain, that many Presbyters and Clergy of the Church of* Rome *had withdrawn themſelves from the Communion of* Anaſtaſius, becauſe he had communicated with *Photi-*

Photinus, a Deacon of *Theſſalonica*, who was a great Friend of *Acacius*, and a generous Aſſerter of his Cauſe: And beſides, they were jealous that he underhand had attempted to reſtore *Acacius*'s Name to the *Roman Diptychs*; adding, that Anaſtaſius *was ſtruck by Divine Vengeance*: Which *Platina* explains, by ſaying, *as he was eaſing Nature his Bowels came from him.* This is a very ridiculous Story, and, in my Opinion, no way tending to the Reputation of the *Infallible Judge* for the Time being. Beſides, it is ſo inconſiſtent, that no ſober Man can be induced to credit it: For is it likely that ſo implacable an Enemy to *Acacius* as Pope *Anaſtaſius* ſhew'd himſelf, by reviving an old Quarrel after the Deceaſe of the Two Principals, ſhould communicate with *Photinus*, the *Friend* and *Champion* of *Acacius* and his Cauſe? It is ſo groſs an Abſurdity, that I cannot ſee what End it can anſwer; or if it could pretend to countenance any Thing, the whole Story is ſuch an incoherent Blunder, that no Body can give the leaſt Credit to it.

They talk of Epiſtles, Fragments in *Baluzius*'s Collection, *Books of the Trinity, of Free-will, Rules of Faith againſt the Pelagian Hereſy, and ſeveral Sermons*, which they tell us were loſt. A very fair Riddance truly; and if the reſt of their Trumpery had periſh'd with them, the Chriſtian World had not been ſo much impos'd upon, nor God's true Religion render'd ſo contemptible, as it has been by their ridiculous and fooliſh Legends. But as for the Works of this Pope, we have only *Platina*'s Word for them; nor does it any where appear from whence he has his News. But his and the Pontifical's Credit may go together; and they who believe either of them, are readily ſuſceptible of any Thing, though never ſo groſs.

[498.] The Pontificate of *Symmachus* is chequer'd with Variety of Accidents; for he is no ſooner conſecrated in one Church, but *Laurence* the Deacon is ordained in another; which caus'd a great Diviſion, not only among the Clergy, but even in the Senate. And yet they will tell you, that there was no Schiſm all this while in the Church; though at the ſame Time they ſay there was an Antipope! But theſe Antipopes, I ſuppoſe, let them be of what Side they will, ſerve to prevent a Vacancy in the *Holy See*; or though there never were ſuch Men, as in the Caſe of *Marcellus*, *&c.* who is cramm'd in only to fill up a Vacancy, they muſt anſwer ſome End. But in this Caſe, the *Infallibility* is divided; Both Competitors claim a Right; and therefore, to put an End to this Controverſy, a Reference is reſolv'd upon to *Theodoric* King of the *Goths*, then at *Ravenna*, who ſoon decided the Matter, by declaring for him that had the moſt Votes, and was firſt conſecrated; which gave it in Favour of *Symmachus*; who being ſecure of the Papacy in the Year 499, calls a Synod at *Rome*, for the ſuppreſſing of ſuing by any Means for the Papacy. Thus do moſt People after a Feaſt proclaim a Faſt, which indeed is but a civil Truce to Nature. In the Year 501, another Sy- is call'd at *Rome*, in the Caſe of Pope *Symmachus*, who, notwithſtanding his *Infallibility*, is ſummon'd to purge himſelf before King *Theodoric*; which it ſeems he did. And the Year following, the old Quarrel about poor *Acacius*, dead and buried, is revived; and *Anaſtaſius* the Emperor is excommunicated by *Symmachus*, for refuſing to raſe *Acacius*'s Name out of the *Diptychs*: For which the Emperor furiouſly reviles him; which Pope *Symmachus* no leſs ſmartly replies to in a brisk Apology. In the ſame Synod, the Caſe between *Symmachus* and

his Competitor *Laurentius* was controverted; which being referr'd again to *Theodoric*, he deputed *Peter Altinas* to determine it, who gave it in Favour of *Laurentius*; upon which *Symmachus* was diſpoſſeſs'd. But the Cauſe being at laſt referr'd by *Theodoric* to a Synod, *Symmachus* was reſtor'd, and *Peter Altinas*, with the reſt of the Adherents of *Laurence*, were depos'd.

Things paſſing at this Rate, What was become of the ſo much boaſted of *Supremacy* and *Infallibility* deriv'd from St. *Peter* to his Succeſſors the Biſhops of *Rome*? Truly, inſtead of being lodg'd in any of them, a reaſonable Man would be apt to think, that the *Supremacy* at beſt was transferr'd to the Secular Prince; and by their frequent Blunders and Stumblings, and even downright Fallings, (for a Pope's turning Heretick is no leſs) they had a poor Pretence to *Infallibility*.

[514.] Pope *Hormiſdas*, after various Tumults, ſends his Legates to *Juſtin*, an Orthodox Emperor, to have *Acacius*'s Name expung'd the *Diptychs*, which with much ado he obtain'd; the Emperor ſacrificing this to the Malice of the Biſhops of *Rome*, which he ſaw was become hereditary, for the Peace of the Church; thereby putting an End to a long and flagrant Schiſm. The Intent of the Emperor was pious; but the *Roman* Pontiffs never after could be brought to recede from theſe Pretentions; which have ſince ſo blown them up, that they have turn'd the Mitre into a Helmet, and the Croſier into a Spear, aſſuming not only a Spiritual but Temporal Sovereignty over moſt of the Princes of the Weſtern Church.

There are 80 Epiſtles extant, and ſome Decrees, in this Pope's Name. *Labb. T.* 4. *p.* 1419. The firſt of which, to the Biſhop of *Rhemes*, whom he appoints his Legate in *Gaul*, is a manifeſt Forgery; for

for in it he compliments King *Lewis*, as newly baptized by *Remigius* Biſhop of *Rhemes*: Whereas this *Lewis* (whom he calls *Clodoveus*) was baptized in the Year 496, and died 509, at leaſt 511, which was, by the laſt Account, Three Years before *Hormiſdas* was Pope. Among this Pope's Decrees, is that Decree ſo much talk'd of in the Life of Pope *Gelaſius*.

[523.] Pope *John* I. ſucceeds *Hormiſdas*; who in the Year 525, is ſent upon a Meſſage (as Supreme as he was) by *Theodoric* to the Emperor *Juſtin*, to entreat him not to deprive the *Arians* of their Churches, which he was about to do; (a pretty Errand for an Orthodox Biſhop to be ſent on!) Whilſt he was upon this Embaſſy at *Conſtantinople*, he refuſed to ſit by *Epiphanius* the Patriarch; demanding a higher Place or Throne to be erected for him: Which Note of Diſtinction was ſo little underſtood by the *Greek* Church, that he was ſoon ſent packing to *Rome re infectâ*: For which, *Theodoric* ſends for him to *Ravenna*, and rewards him with a Priſon, where he breathed his laſt; and deſervedly, for going on an Embaſſy in Behalf of Hereticks.

There are Two Epiſtles aſcrib'd to this Pope: Both which are by all the Editors look'd upon as ſuppoſititious. The Date of the firſt is own'd to be falſe by *Binius* himſelf; for *Maximus* and *Olibrius* were never Conſuls together, the firſt ſerving that Office, *A. D.* 523, and the latter 528. Beſides, the former Part of this Epiſtle is taken out of Pope *Zachary*'s Firſt and Pope *Innocent*'s Second Epiſtle; but the greateſt Part of it, *viz.* from the firſt fifteen Lines, is ſtolen from Pope *Euſebius*'s Second Decree. *Labb. T.* 4. *p.* 1604. As to the Second Epiſtle, it begins the ſame with *Leo*'s 70th Epiſtle. And *Gregory* of *Turen*, *l. de Gloria Martyr. c.* 40.

c. 40. ſeems to be the Fountain from whence the reſt of it came. But that which moſt plainly demonſtrates this Epiſtle not to have been Pope *John*'s, is the Date, which is the 3d of the Ides of *June*; *Maximus* and *Olibrius* being Conſuls; (which cannot be,) for, as has been noted before, theſe Two could never be Conſuls together: And if they will have this Pope the Author of this Epiſtle, he muſt write it after he was dead; for he died the 18th of *May* before: And yet *Binius* has the Confidence to defend theſe Epiſtles as genuine. But few of the Editors are of his Mind; which I ſhould very much commend, did they not foiſt theſe Forgeries into their Collections; for if they are fictitious, What do they there? But truly, their introducing them, though with Cautions that they are ſuſpicious or forg'd, looks as if they were intended for ſomething, and ſtand there to be made Uſe of as Opportunity ſhall offer. And till they are left out, I ſee no Reaſon any Man can have to think well of any of them.

[527.] Pope *John* dying in Priſon, *Felix* is named his Succeſſor by *Theodoric*: Againſt whom *Baronius* exclaims moſt unmercifully, *An.* 526. And truly he has Cauſe; for it looks a little odd for an Heretical Prince (for ſuch, or, at leaſt, a great Patron of them, was *Theodoric*) to chooſe the *Supreme Infallible Judge*. He was reckon'd, they tell us, a very honeſt Man among the *Roman* Clergy: But it had been no Matter for Character; *Baronius* would not have rail'd for that, let his Character have been as black as might be, the Papacy takes off all Note of Infamy. The Perſon nominating him is that which nettles *Baronius*.

The Three Epiſtles aſcribed to him are moſt ſcandalous forgeries; which, if they ſeem but to ſupport any Part of the Papal Authority, (which

they are generally made for) muſt paſs for genuine. Part of the Firſt Epiſtle is taken out of the 54th and 84th Epiſtles of *Leo*, *Gregory*'s 36th Epiſtle, *Innocent*'s 4th Epiſtle, and *Siricius*'s 4th Epiſtle. The Second is taken out of *Innocent*'s 13th Epiſtle, and *Gregory*'s Epiſtle to *Auguſtin* and his Companions in *England*, and is in *Bede*, *l.* 1. *c.* 13. and dated the 12th of the Calends of *November*, *Lampadius* and *Oreſtes* being Conſuls: Which Chronology, ſay *Baronius* and *Binius*, is falſe; for *Boniface*, and not *Felix*, ſate in the Papal Chair the latter End of *October*: But *Labbé* declares the whole Epiſtle to be a Forgery, *T.* 4. *p.* 1657. The Third Epiſtle is of the ſame Piece, as may be ſeen in the foreſaid Places.

[530.] About this Time there had like to have been another Flaw in the Succeſſion; but *Dioſcurus* the Antipope dying ſoon, put an End to it, and left *Boniface* II. in quiet Poſſeſſion of the Chair; who, to ſhew his Power, anathematizes dead *Dioſcurus*. But poor *Boniface*, it ſeems, had more Courage to encounter the Dead than the Living: For deſigning to prevent the *Gothick* Kings from meddling in the Diſpoſing of the Papacy hereafter, he calls a Synod at *Rome*, and appoints *Vigilius* the Deacon his Succeſſor. This, indeed, would have been ſecuring a Succeſſion to ſome Purpoſe, tho' moſt immethodical and uncanonical. But here follows the Trial of *Boniface*'s Courage. No ſooner did King *Athalarick* hear of theſe Matters, but he ſeverely checks Pope *Boniface*, who readily retracts his Decree of Succeſſion, which he burn'd in the Preſence of all the Clergy and Senate, and owns himſelf guilty of Treaſon. There are very few Inſtances hitherto in any of theſe Prelates of *Rome*, that ever ſhew'd any Steadineſs of Temper, eſpecially in the Right.

There

There are Two Epiſtles charged upon this poor Criminal; which he was as innocent of as any of his Predeceſſors. The Firſt, to *Eulalius* of *Alexandria*, is an infamous Piece of Impoſture; and which *Bellarmine*, whom we may believe in this Caſe, queſtions in theſe Words, *l.* 2. *de Rom. Pon. c.* 25. Eulalius *of* Alexandria, *to whom* Boniface *ſeems to write, was not at that Time, if ever, in being: as is plain from* Nicephorus. *Beſides,* Boniface *hints in this Epiſtle, That he wrote to* Juſtin *the Emperor; but* Juſtin *was dead before* Boniface *was Pope.* Moreover, this Epiſtle is for the moſt Part taken out of Two Fragments, one of which is ſtolen from *Hormiſda*'s Epiſtle to *John*; the other from St. *Gregory*'s Epiſtle to the Biſhops of *Gaul*, *l.* 4. *Ep.* 52. which is very certain, for the Style beſpeaks it St. *Gregory*'s; which is likewiſe *Baronius*'s Thought. As to *Eulalius* of *Alexandria*, *Poſſevin*, in his *Apparat. Sacr. Verb.* is of the ſame Opinion with *Baronius*, both agreeing, that there was no ſuch Perſon at that Time as *Eulalius*, (*Timothy* the Third being then Biſhop) nor was there ever before or after ſuch a Perſon as *Eulalius* in the Catalogue of the *Alexandrian* Biſhops.

But beſides this we have another undeniable Inſtance of this Epiſtle's being ſuppoſititious. This Epiſtle ſays, That the Church of *Afric*, from the Time of the Sixth Council of *Carthage* to Pope *Boniface* II. (which is an Hundred Years) did not communicate with the Church of *Rome*, by reaſon of *Zoſimus*'s commonitory Epiſtle, *&c.* But this the Eighth Epiſtle of Pope *Celeſtine* to the Biſhops of *France* makes to be an apparent Falſity: For in that *Celeſtine* defends St. *Auguſtine* againſt certain Biſhops of *France*, who ſaid, St. *Auguſtine*'s Doctrine about Free-Will was not ſound, becauſe it too much leſſen'd the Liberty of Man. In Anſwer to whom,

Celeſtine writes, "That as for *Auguſtine*, a Man "ever to be remember'd for his Holineſs of Life, "and other Merits, we always look'd upon him to "be in our Communion.

The other Epiſtle is dated under wrong Conſuls, *Lab. T.* 4. *p.* 1683. and conſequently falſe: As is that Profeſſion of Faith pretended to be *Juſtin*'s; for *Binius* and *Baronius* ſay, That he died Four Years before the Date of it: Beſides, it is patch'd up out of *Hormiſda*'s Epiſtle to the *Spaniſh* Biſhops, and out of *John*'s, Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, and ſeveral others. It is dated in the Third Year of *Juſtin*'s Conſulſhip; but at that Time *John*, and not *Boniface*, preſided in the Church of *Rome*.

[532.] *John* II. ſirnamed *Mercurius*, ſucceeded *Boniface*. To him Six Epiſtles are aſcribed: The Firſt of which is rejected by *Labbé* and others as ſpurious.

[535.] *Agapetus* no ſooner aſcends the Papal Chair, but notably beſtirs himſelf; though he gives the *Infallibility* an unlucky Stroke, by reſcinding ſome of Pope *Boniface*'s Acts, and abſolving *Dioſcurus*, whom *Boniface* had condemned after he was dead. In Truth, conſidering the Time in which they were both done, the Sentence and Abſolution were equally inſignificant.

We have no particular Account how this Pope was advanced to the Chair: And I verily believe they deſignedly drop'd it; for it is ſcarce to be ſuppos'd, that the *Gothick* Kings, who had once taken upon them the Nomination of the Biſhops to the See of *Rome*, would ever part with it: Nay, we ſee, that when *Boniface* attempted to reſume it from the Temporal Power, *Athalarick* made him recant, and own himſelf guilty of Treaſon. Beſides, it is very reaſonable to believe, that whilſt the *Goths* held Part of the *Roman* Empire, they kept

kept this Nomination to the See of *Rome* in their own Hands; and this may fairly be infer'd from the Authority thoſe Princes exercis'd over the Popes. As for Inſtance, in the Caſe of *John* I. who was ſent on an Errand, and a very ſcandalous one too, and that in Defence of no leſs than *Arian* Hereticks, by *Theodoric* to the Emperor *Juſtin*. This he durſt not refuſe, but perform'd, tho' without Succeſs; for the Emperor, (much a better Chriſtian than the Pope, would not comply with his Requeſt. Upon which he return'd, and is by his Maſter *Theodoric* put in Priſon, where he died. *Felix*, indeed, they own to be named by *Theodoric*; and I queſtion not but all the reſt, during the *Gothick* Government, were nominated by them. O wretched *Supremacy!* O ridiculous *Infallibility!*

What I have ſaid on the Point of the Papal Slavery, is here made good again in the Perſon of Pope *Agapetus*; for in Spight of the pretended *Supremacy*, *Theodatus* the *Goth* ſends him to the Emperor *Juſtinian* to deprecate his Arms from *Italy*; which his *Infallibility* could not obtain, and, I ſuppoſe, dreading the Fate of his Predeceſſor Pope *John* I. did not care to run the Hazard of a Priſon by returning Home, but tarried at *Conſtantinople*, where he died. Whilſt he was here, *Anthimus* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, being detected of the *Eutychean* Hereſy, was depoſed, and *Menna* ordained in his Place.

Of the Seven Epiſtles ſaid to be his, the Fifth to *Anthimus* is a plain Forgery; as appears, not only by the falſe Date, but by the Epiſtle it ſelf: For the Beginning of it is the ſame with Pope *Hormiſda*'s 80th Epiſtle, and the Body of it is taken out of *Leo* I.'s 97th Epiſtle. This *Labbé* owns, *T.* 4. *p.* 1795, and, which is much to be wondred at, *Binius* by the Date pretends to diſcover the Cheat.

[536.] The Life of *Sylverius* is very entertaining, for it affords Variety of Matter. The *Pontifical* fooliſhly blunders out, That he was the Son of Pope *Hormiſda*; which the Editors dare not deny, becauſe the *Pontifical* ſays it. And therefore *Binius* ſoftens it with a very impertinent Note. *No Doubt but he was legitimate, and born in preceding Wedlock, otherwiſe he could not have arrived to that Dignity.* The Ambiguity of this Note inſinuates an Illegitimacy, and the Word *preceding* is put in with no other Deſign, but to introduce and countenance their Celibacy after Ordination.

In the next Place, the *Pontifical* caſts a foul Suſpicion of Simony on *Sylverius*, in theſe Words: *He was advanc'd to the Papacy by the Tyrant* Theodatus, *without the Deliberation of a Decree. Which* Theodatus *being corrupted with Money, became very terrible to the Clergy; for thoſe who did not conſent to this Election were put to the Sword.* Which Words of the *Pontifical*, *Binius*, to colour over with another Meaning, tells us, *There could be no Simony in* Sylverius, *becauſe* Liberatus, *who lived in thoſe Days, remembers nothing of it; beſides,* Sylverius, *in a little Book which he wrote about the Condemnation of* Vigilius, *charges him with Simony, which he would not have taken the Freedom to do, had he been guilty of it himſelf.* This is a wretched Excuſe indeed, for as to *Liberatus*'s not taking Notice, I think I may fairly ask this Queſtion, What Hiſtorian takes Notice of, or mentions all Occurrencies? Undoubtely, it is to the Variety of Authors that we are obliged for the Acts of Times, one making out another. And as for *Sylverius*'s charging *Vigilius* with Simony, I think it's very prepoſterous; for *Vigilius* loſt the Papacy, and I ſhould think, if there were any Simony in this Caſe, it were moſt likely in him that obtain'd the Promotion, not in him that loſt it. For in

Caſes

Caſes of this Nature, the higheſt Bidder generally carries the Point. However let the Simony lie where it will, it's moſt certain there was Bribery in the Caſe; only *Binius* will not lay it upon the Pope, (for he muſt not be thought to err). But ſuppoſe *Vigilius* to have been the Perſon guilty of Simony, tho' he was not then Pope, yet he afterwards obtain'd the Papacy, which ought not to be done, for the 29th Apoſtolick Canon, the 2d of *Chalcedon*, and many others, depoſe and excommunicate all *Simoniacks*, who are thereupon uncapable of any further Promotion in the Church. I ſhall defer the reſt of *Sylverius*'s Pontificate till we come to *Vigilius*, his Murderer and Succeſſor, and proceed to this Pope's Epiſtles, as they call them; the Firſt of which is to *Vigilius*, wherein he accuſes him of Ambition and Simony, and pronounces Sentence againſt him. The other is to one *Amator*, a Biſhop. But theſe muſt be both falſe by the Conſular Note, for there were no ſuch Perſons as *Belliſarius* and *Baſilius* Conſuls during *Sylverius*'s Pontificate.

[540.] *Vigilius* wades to the Pontifical Throne thro' his Succeſſor's Blood; who, at the Inſtigation of *Vigilius*, by Command of the *Gothick* King *Theodate*, is depoſed by General *Belliſarius*, and baniſh'd to *Patara*, a City of *Lycia*, where he calls a Synod conſiſting of a few Friends and Brethren Biſhops, and condemns *Vigilius*. At length he is ſent back by *Juſtinian* the Emperor to *Italy*, that his Cauſe might be fairly and ſynodically heard; but by the Eaſineſs of *Belliſarius* he is committed to *Vigilius*'s Care, who forthwith tranſports him to the Iſland *Palmaria*, where for ſome Time he lived in a ſtarving Condition, and at laſt was murder'd by two Aſſaſſines ſent on that Purpoſe. And thus *Vigilius* ſucceeded: But the Divine Juſtice purſued him;

for he lived to ſee himſelf deſerted and diſtreſs'd, his Actions rendering him ſo infamous, that the Clergy and People of *Rome* refus'd Communion with him, expung'd his Name out of the Diptychs, and conſtituted *Pelagius* Pope. The *Africans* call a Synod, and excommunicate him the *Catholick* Church, reſerving Reſtitution only upon Repentance. For his prevaricating with *Juſtinian* the Emperor, tho' he fled to the Altar for Refuge, yet was he rudely torn from thence; then by the Emperor's Command he is drag'd through the City with a Rope about his Neck, and at laſt thrown into Priſon, where he indur'd great Affliction. But before his Death the Emperor and he being reconciled, he came to *Syracuſe* in *Sicily*, where the 7th of *May*, 555. he died of the Stone.

Now, conſidering the many and remarkable Inſtances of humane Frailty in the Biſhops of *Rome*, I think the Champions of that Biſhop's Infallibility, of all People, ought to be ſilent. For I challenge the World to produce, either from Sacred or prophane Story, any one Series, Generation, or Order of Men to this Day, that has been guilty of ſuch Failing, Weakneſs, Unſteadineſs, Cruelty, *&c.* as they have.

[555.] *Pelagius* was forced to clear himſelf of a Deſign to murder *Vigilius*, before he could be admitted to the Papacy; which he did, and obtain'd it: But what a ſad Time muſt it be, when none but ſtigmatiz'd Perſons, and with no leſs Crimes, or Suſpicions at leaſt, than thoſe of Murder, ſhould be Candidates for this high Dignity!

The Editors pretend 16 Epiſtles to be written by this Pope, *Lab. T.* 5. *p.* 788. which they publiſh with all Aſſurance imaginable, tho' at the ſame Time they own the Firſt to be a Forgery, being partly ſtolen from Pope *Leo*'s 35th Epiſtle. Beſides the

the Date condemns it. And yet this muſt paſs, and in the Front too. Another notorious Inſtance of this Kind, we have in the Life of

[559.] Pope *John* III. the Succeſſor of *Pelagius*. For tho' *Labbé*, *T.* 5. *p.* 823. in the Margin, ridicules *Binius* about the Epiſtle of this Pope, affirming that all learned Men looked upon it as ſpurious. And tho' he plainly tells us this Epiſtle is taken out of ſeveral of S. *Leo*'s, *Innocent*'s, *Gregory*'s, *Zozimus*, *Celeſtine*, *&c.* and that it is a Cheat of ſome of *Iſidore*'s Diſciples, and ſuch as none but Men of weak Judgment would credit; yet, with all this Train of Scandal, it ſhall be inſerted by the Editors; and for theſe Reaſons, (tho' in my Opinion poor ones.) It is cited by *Turrian*, *Pro Epiſtolis Pont. l.* 2. *c.* 10. to prove, That *Linus* and *Cletus* were not Biſhops of *Rome*, but Coadjutors to St. *Peter*. It is cited alſo by *Bellarmine*, *l.* 1. *de Cleric. c.* 17. to prove, That the *Chorepiſcopi* could do many Things which Biſhops did. But, ſays *Binius*, out of *Baronius*, *An.* 572. *n.* 3. This Epiſtle was written by ſome Impoſtor, after the Death of Pope *John* III. for ſeveral Reaſons: 1. It is dated under the 6th Conſulſhip of *Juſtin*, and the 14th of the Calends of *Auguſt*, in the 7th Year of *Juſtin*, and of Chriſt 572, at which Time Pope *John* III. was dead. 2. It is dated under Conſuls, which Cuſtom was then left off, the Office ceaſing with *Baſilius*, the laſt Conſul. 3. It ſays, That *Linus* and *Cletus* were Coadjutors, which all Writers of Antiquity can contradict. Beſides, the Name *Chorepiſcopi*, about whoſe Office the whole Epiſtle is written, and to the Biſhops of *Gaul* and *Germany*, was at that Time aboliſh'd in thoſe two Countries.

[573.] When, by Reaſon of War and Tumults, the See of *Rome* had lain vacant Ten Months and three Days, *Benedictus* was created Pope.

Pope. And although this Pope made ſo very poor a Figure, that little is ſaid of him, yet, according to Cuſtom, he muſt have an Epiſtle tack'd to him. Tho' *Labbé*, *T.* 5. *p.* 915. *in Marg.* ſays, *They are ſome of* Iſidore's *Wares.* For the Firſt Part of this Epiſtle is taken out of St. *Gregory*'s 41*ſt Ep. l.* 1. and the Latter Part out of *Ithacius* to *Varindus*, *c.* 1.

[579.] *Pelagius* II. ſucceeds in a turbulent Seaſon; a Schiſm devouring the Church within, and a barbarous Enemy deſtroying it without; for at that Time the *Lombards* had ſeiz'd all *Italy*, and cloſely beſieged *Rome*. To appeaſe which Tumults, *Pelagius* begs Help of the Emperor. But not being able, by any Arguments, to prevail with *Severus* and other Biſhops of *Iſtria* to be reconcil'd, he makes Uſe (good Man!) of the Arm of Fleſh, and compels them to communicate with him. It was in this Pope's Time that *John* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* aſſum'd to himſelf the Title of *Univerſal*, which he cauſed to be ſynodically confirm'd. *Pelagius* ſtorms, and threatens to excommunicate him unleſs he retract this Decree; but he might as well have ſaid nothing.

Among the Epiſtles aſcrib'd to this Pope, the Firſt, ſays *Labbé*, *T.* 5. *p.* 931. *in Marg.* comes out of the old Shop of Impoſtures, *Iſidore*'s. And the Second, the Editors themſelves own to be ſuppoſititious. *T.* 5. *p.* 931. *in Marg.* and, *p.* 935. *ibid.* After ſuch an Acknowledgment, I ſee no Reaſon for inſerting theſe Fictions.

[590.] After a Vacancy of Six Months, *Gregory*, ſirnamed the *Great*, is promoted to the Pontificate. A Man, for his regular Life, and publick Spirit to do good, juſtly deſerving the Character of *Great*. Tho' his too haſty Zeal did an irreparable Dammage in Burning the *Palatine* Library, where-

in

in many valuable Monuments of Antiquity periſh'd.

There are 12 Books of Epiſtles extant in this Pope's Name, amongſt which not a few ſuppoſititious; for the Reputation of a good Man, they imagined, would carry off any Thing. The 32d Epiſtle, *l.* 12. to *Felix* Biſhop of *Meſſana*, is own'd by the Editors to be falſe. *Lab. T.* 5. *p.* 1578. The 18th Epiſtle, *l.* 5. to *John* Biſhop of *Syracuſe*, is cited by *Bellarmine*, *de Rom. Pont. l.* 2. *c.* 14. to prove the *Supremacy*. And though in *Labbé*'s Edition of the Councils there is no ſuch Perſon as *Euſebius* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* ſpoken of, yet in all the other Editors there is frequent Mention of *Euſebius*; tho' it is moſt certain, that for many Years before or after *Gregory*'s Time, there was no ſuch Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* as *Euſebius*.

There is a moſt abominable Forgery in *Ep.* 54. *l.* 7. about *Gregory*'s ſending Images to *Secundinus*, which is often cited by *Bellarmine de Imag. l.* 2. *c.* 10, 11. and contains that nice Diſtinction of not worſhipping the Image, but that which is repreſented by the Image. But the Paſſage which ſeems to encourage this, is not to be found in any genuine Edition or MSS. But this is not the only Forgery in this Epiſtle, for in the Middle of it, there are above Forty Lines thruſt in, which are not in the *Roman* Edition.

In the 38th Epiſtle, *l.* 4. there is a very ſcandalous Depravation, where the Word *Exitus* is put inſtead of *Exercitus*, *&c.* The Paſſage is this: *The King of Pride is near, and (which is a Wickedneſs to name) a whole Hoſt of Prieſts is provided to attend his Coming.* But the *Roman*, and moſt other Editions, read quite contrary to the Faith of the MSS. thus; *And the Prieſts ſhall be executed and put to Death.* This you muſt know was foiſted in to foretel King

Hen-

Henry VIII's putting the Prieſts to Death, which is a very unlucky Blunder, for the ſubſequent Word, *Militant*, (do march) makes the Matter clear againſt them: For if they were put to Death, How ſhould they walk up and down? Unleſs they did as St. *Denis* is ſaid to have done, carried his Head in his Hand. But this Epiſtle was written to tax the Pride of *John* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, who about that Time had taken upon him the Title of *Univerſal* Biſhop. Doctor *James*, *Corrupt. &c. p.* 226, 230, *&c.*

At the End of the 12th Book of Epiſtles, in St. *Gregory*'s *Privilege*, which he is ſaid to grant to the Monaſtery of St. *Medrad*. This Privilege you muſt imagine a choice one, ſince almoſt all the Champions of the Pontificate quote it, but eſpecially *Bellarmine*, *de Rom. Pont. l.* 2. *c.* 19. and *Coſter*'s *Apolog. par.* 1. *p.* 65. to prove, *That* POPES *may depoſe* KINGS. *And whatſoever King, Prelate, Judge,* &c. *ſhall violate the Decrees of this Privilege, ſhall be puniſh'd with this dreadful Anathema*, viz. *He ſhall be deprived of his Honour, and the Converſe of Chriſtians, be excluded the Communion of the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt*, [By the Way obſerve, that Communion in both Kinds was ſtill uſed to the Laity.] *and ſhall be condemned with* Judas *and all Infidels and Hereticks, unleſs by due Repentance he reconciles himſelf. Lab. T.* 5. 1584, 1585. What a dreadful Thing is it, to ſee Mankind ſo wicked, as to introduce an impious Sham with ſuch Solemnity, and proſtitute the bleſſed Body and Blood of our Saviour to their ridiculous Impoſtures? This very Privilege, and the Anathema attending it, are alike fictititious, as appears from the Subſcription; for it is dated the Calends of *June*, *A. D.* 594. and the Subſcribers to it are, *Auguſtin* Biſhop of *Canterbury*, *Mellitus* Biſhop of *London*, and *Theodoric* King of *Gaul*: Which can-

cannot be, for *Auguſtin* was not ſent into *England* till 596, neither was *Mellitus* made Biſhop of *London* till 604, nor was *Theodoric* King of *Gaul* till 596. Theſe Circumſtances are undeniably true, and *Baronius* is forced to give up this *Sham Privilege* as a Cheat upon this Conviction. *An.* 593. *n.* 84.

Thus far the Editors are beholden to the *Pontifical* for their Shams and Forgeries, which breaking off here, they muſt depend on their own Ingenuity; which, to give them their Due, is fertil enough upon Occaſion.

[604.] *Sabinian* ſucceeds *Gregory the Great*, to whom, (which is no ſmall Wonder) they aſcribe no Epiſtle nor Decree, except one in a *Roman* Council, *A. D.* 606, about the Election of a Pope.

[614.] Till *Deuſdedit*'s Time they are pretty quiet, in whoſe Pontificate *Labbé, in Marg. T.* 5. *p.* 1648. diſcovers a very foul Piece of Impoſture in the Epiſtle pretended to be written by this Pope to *Gordianus* Biſhop of *Sevil* in *Spain*, which carries an apparent Cheat in the very Front of it; for *Iſidore* owns, That he was Biſhop of *Sevil* from the Year 600 to 636, nor did he admit of any Collegue from the Year 614 to 617. Now ſince *Labbé* profeſſes himſelf one of, or the only Diſcoverer of this Forgery, I cannot conceive for what Reaſon he ſhould inſert the Epiſtle, when the Title condemns it; except, as I have mark'd before, to be kept till it ſhall anſwer ſome vile Purpoſe, and then it ſhall be quoted for genuine Truth.

[617.] Upon the Deceaſe of *Deuſdedit*, *Boniface* IV. is choſen Pope, in whoſe Time there is ſomething worth Notice. *Mellitus* being dead, *Juſtus* Biſhop of *Rocheſter* ſucceeds him in the See of *Canterbury*; to whom *Boniface* ſends the *Pall* as a Preſent, with Letters, impowering him to conſecrate Biſhops. Now who could have ſtudied a greater

greater Abuſe upon this Pope, or invented a more ridiculous Story than this? For this was what neither King *Eadbald* nor *Juſtus* ever deſired of him, the ancient Canons of the Church having long before inveſted every Provincial Biſhop with that Power.

[626.] Pope *Honorius* is another remarkable Inſtance of Frailty in the *Infallible Judge of all Controverſies*. For in the Year 633, when *Cyrus* of *Alexandria* had by a ſynodical Decree confirm'd, that *there was but one Will in Chriſt*; and that *Sophronius* Patriarch of *Jeruſalem*, who was preſent at *Alexandria*, having diſputed the Point, withdrew from the Communion of *Cyrus*; *Sergius* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* acquaints *Honorius* with the whole Matter by Letters: Who, in his Anſwer, approves what *Cyrus* had done, and condemns *Sophronius*, confeſſing but one *Operating Will* in Chriſt; pretending to confirm his heretical Opinions by Authority of Holy Scripture and the Fathers; as appears in his Third and Fourth Epiſtle to *Sergius*. *Lab. T.* 5. *p.* 1682, 1683. And tho' this is plain from his own Acknowledgment, yet *Labbé*, with an unuſual Aſſurance, in the Margin, *ib.* would ſeem to take this Scandal off from *Honorius*, by ſaying, *This is but meanly proved upon him.* And whilſt *Binius*, in his Notes upon *Honorius*'s Third Epiſtle to *Sergius*, by frivolous Arguments, and petty Subterfuges, would wipe off this Scandal, he confirms it from the very Words of the Epiſtle: *We acknowledge but One Will in our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* This is moſt diſingenuous Dealing, to pretend to invalidate a Truth by confirming it. But it is only a Deſign to palliate the Hereſy of a Pope by a verboſe Amuſement, that the People ſhould not ſee too far into their Failings. So little do theſe Men value their Reputation, if they can by any Fraud colour their *Infallible Guide*'s Back-

ſliding. But this will not paſs upon Men of common Underſtanding, if they look farther, for

[639.] Pope *John* IV. who ſucceeded *Severinus*, after a Pontificate of two Months, calling a Council *A. D.* 639. condemns *Heraclius*'s *Expoſition*, and the *Monotheletick* Hereſy. And tho' *Honorius*'s lapſing into this Hereſy was ſo very notorious, as appears by his own Confeſſion in the Epiſtles before cited; yet this Pope *John*, in his *Apology* to the Emperor *Conſtantine*, defends *Honorius*. But the fore-mentioned Council, which is taken from the *Libellus Synodicus*, and publiſh'd by the Editors among the Councils, and by them own'd to be an *Orthodox* Council, plainly condemns *Honorius*; for it ſays in expreſs Words, *That the Thrice Bleſſed Pope* John *ſucceeded* Honorius *the* Monothelite. This, I think, is as plain as Demonſtration can make any Thing; and ſuch as no Shuffling or Amuſement can refute.

[641.] *Theodore*, a *Greek* by Nation, the Year after his Advancement to the Papacy, anſwers the ſynodical Epiſtle of *Paul* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, condemning the *Heraclean Expoſition*, demanding a Hearing of *Pyrrhus*'s Cauſe in a Synod, and accuſing *Patriarch Paul* of intruding into *Pyrrhus*'s See before he was condemned. To which Purpoſe, he treats with the People of *Conſtantinople*, and the Biſhops who had ordain'd *Paul*. And when *Pyrrhus* return'd from *Africk*, upon his Repentance and Orthodox Confeſſion, he is received into Communion with *Theodore*, who deals with the Emperor *Conſtans* about reſtoring him to the See of *Conſtantinople*. But in the Year 648, calling a Synod at *Rome*, he excommunicates *Paul*, whom he had two Years before condemned, and *Pyrrhus*, who return'd to his old Vomit. A hopeful *Infallibility* indeed, alternatively excommunicating aud reſtoring!

[649.] Pope

[649.] Pope *Martin*, in his First Year, ſummons a Council of an Hundred and Five Biſhops, called the *Lateran Council*, in which he condemned the Emperor *Conſtans*'s Edict, *Sergius*, *Pyrrhus*, and *Paul*, the *Conſtantinopolitan* Patriarchs, *Cyrus* of *Alexandria*, *&c.* fortifying the Catholick Doctrine of the Two Wills in Chriſt with good Canons, and anathematizing the *Monotheletick* Hereſy. He was, in ſhort, a Man of great Piety and Zeal for the Catholick Faith, and his Acts in Defence of the Church againſt its moſt dangerous Enemies, have recommended his Memory to Poſterity. But it fared quite otherwiſe with his Succeſſor,

[655.] *Vitalianus*, who acted quite different to the Methods and Practice of his pious Predeceſſor. He was a Man of a moſt ſlaviſh Spirit; for when the Emperor *Conſtans* came to *Rome*, he received him with the moſt abject Obſequiouſneſs imaginable, very much unbecoming the Character of the *Roman Pontiff.* And when *Maurus* Biſhop of *Ravenna* was excommunicated by *Vitalianus*, becauſe he would not appear at *Rome* upon his Summons, *Maurus* rang juſt ſuch another Peal in his Holineſs's Ears; for to ſhew how lightly he valued him, he excommunicates *Vitalianus*; and being at the Point of Death, he obliges all the Biſhops of his Province by Oath to pay no Acknowledgment to the Biſhop of *Rome.* So that to this Time we ſee, the Power of the Papacy was not grown to that Extent to be thought dangerous, not even to its near Neighbours.

[683.] *Leo* II. a *Sicilian* by Birth, ſucceeds; whoſe Life, the very Editors own, affords Variety of *Infamous Matter.* There are extant in his Name Five Epiſtles, which we will examine with the Obſervations of the Editors themſelves, and others.

The First Epiſtle, ſays *Cook*, *p.* 215. is ſaid to have been ſent to the Emperor *Conſtantine*. This Epiſtle is queſtioned by *Baronius*, *An.* 683. *n.* 13, 14. by *Poſſevin*, in *Apparat. Sacr. Verb. Leo* 2. and by *Binius*, in his Notes on the Epiſtles. *Lab. T.* 6. *p.* 1245, *& ſeq.* Yet this Epiſtle, as falſe as it is proved to be by the Editors themſelves, is quoted by the Champions of the *Pontificate* to prove the *Supremacy*. *Coccius* cites it in his *Eccleſiaſtick Hierarchy*, to prove, *That Councils approv'd and confirm'd by the Biſhop of* Rome *are of the greateſt Authority*.

The Second Epiſtle, under the Name of *Leo* II. to the Biſhops of *Spain*, is cited by *Coccius*, *To.* 1. *l.* 7. *p.* 865. *de Hierarch. Eccleſ.* to prove, *That the Biſhops of* Rome *did in all Times from the Beginning claim and exerciſe a Supremacy in all Churches.* But *Poſſevin*, *in Apparat. Sac. Verb. Leo* 2. ſays, *There are ſome Epiſtles under the Name of* Leo II. *which want Credit, being ſuppoſed to be Counterfeit; ſuch as is that to the Biſhops of* Spain. Beſides, *Binius*, in his Notes out of *Baronius*, *Lab. &c. T.* 6. *p.* 1248. ſays, (and not without Reaſon) *This Epiſtle, with the Three following*, Baronius *condemns as ſpurious, becauſe in every one of them it is affirm'd, That the General Council was finiſh'd the Ninth Indiction, whereas it is plain it was the Tenth*, &c.

The Third Epiſtle of this Pope to *Quiricus* is by *Baronius* concluded a Forgery; for there never was any Biſhop of *Spain* of that Name except *Quiricus* Biſhop of *Toledo*, who dying Seven Years before, was ſucceeded by *Julian*, who lived in the Time of *Leo* II. and was at the 11th Council of *Toledo*. *Baron. An.* 683. *n.* 19.

The Fourth Epiſtle of *Leo* II. is ſaid to be written to the Lord *Glorioſus*, Son of Count *Simplicius*. But *Labbé*, *T.* 6. *p.* 1249. in the Margin, affirms, The Name of *Simplicius* was not to be found among

the Counts that ſubſcribed to the 11th Council of *Toledo*. And beſides, as the ſame *Labbé* hints in the Place cited, Part of this Epiſtle is ſtolen out of *Agatho*'s Epiſtle.

There is a Paſſage in the Fifth Epiſtle, which evidently detects it to be an Impoſture; *viz. The moſt pious and Chriſtian Emperor ſent his Imperial Letters to our Predeceſſor* Agatho, *of Apoſtolick Memory*, &c. *Which is apparently falſe, for the Emperor wrote to Pope* Donus, *and not to Pope* Agatho, *about calling a General Council, and dated his Letters, not the Ninth, but Sixth Indiction.* But *Baronius* puts an End to this at once; for he ſays, *They cannot be* Leo's *Epiſtles*, but are counterfeited by ſome Body in *Leo*'s Name *An.* 683. *n.* 17.

[684.] *Benedict* II. a *Roman* by Birth, ſucceeds *Leo* II. This Pope, if there is any Credit to be given to *Anaſtaſius*, obtained an Edict from the Emperor *Conſtantine*, whereby the Perſon elected to the See of *Rome* ſhould forthwith, without waiting for the Emperor's further Orders, be conſecrated. But this is not very probable, for the Imperial Authority in the Confirmation of Biſhops of *Rome* continued beyond theſe Times. From theſe two laſt Paſſages the ingenuous Reader will naturally conclude the Dependency of the *Roman Pontificate* on the Emperor in theſe Times; for they were not confirm'd in the Papacy but by the Emperor's Order. So that hitherto it's plain the Biſhops of *Rome* had not aſſumed to themſelves the Civil Power.

Rather than this Pope ſhall be ſaid to do little, he ſhall be the ſuppoſed Father of two Epiſtles, which *Baronius* damns at once. For, ſays he, the Acts of the 14th Council of *Toledo* make theſe appear to be Cheats. For the latter is the ſame with *Leo* II.'s to King *Ervigius*. And there is a ſuppoſititious Epiſtle of *Benedict*'s among the Epiſtles of *Leo* II. I think, the Fifth in Number begins thus: *Since there is but one King, God*, &c.

[685.] Since

[685.] Since Pope *John* V. had written no Epiſtles, leſt he ſhould make no Figure at all, the Editors are reſolved to find him ſome Employment. And therefore, to vary the dull old Cuſtom of Epiſtles, he ſhall be ſuppoſed to write an *Order* or *Declaration*, which was the Emperor *Juſtinian*'s, tho' it is tack'd to this Pope. It begins thus: *Having great Care and Concern for the eſtabliſhing the immaculate Faith of Chriſt*, &c. This looks more like an Imperial Edict, than a Papal Decree; I mean, not ſo much for the Senſe of it, as for the Manner of it. However, certain it is, this Copy is extant among the Acts of the Third *Conſtantinopolitan* Council. This *Labbé* and *Coſſart* cannot deny: But *Binius*, in his Notes on this *Declaration*, confirms what he would contradict. *This Epiſtle*, ſays he, *ſeems to be ſuſpicious, becauſe there is a Repugnancy in the Date; for at that Time* Agatho *was Pope. Beſides, it is not very credible that the Emperor (who was not very Sound in Matters of Faith at that Time, as appears by* Nicholas I.'s *Epiſtle to the Emperor* Michael*) ſhould be ſollicitous for the Preſervation of the Acts of the Sixth General Council*, &c. And yet *Binius*, depending ſolely upon the Credit of *Anaſtaſius*, vindicates this *Declaration*, which he had before condemned, from Forgery and Impoſture.

[686.] There being no Epiſtle or Decree aſcribed to Pope *Conon*, *Binius* will not let him paſs thus naked; and therefore, in his Notes upon this Pope's Life, he offers a Thing worth Obſervation. *When* Juſtinian *the Emperor*, ſays he, *would not be perſuaded to reſtore to the Apoſtolick See the Liberty of Chooſing the Biſhop, he commanded, that no Pope ſhould be created without the Conſent of his Viceroy. From whence began that wicked Cuſtom among the Candidates for the Pontificate to bribe the Viceroy.* A very fair Confeſſion truly! And yet this very *Binius* is a ſtrenuous Aſſerter of the Pope's Innocence in the Caſe

of *Simony*. But with him Bribery is no Simony, and Gifts and Preſents are no Bribery.

[715.] In the Life of Pope *Gregory* II. the Editors pretend to palm upon the World the Original and Uſe of Holy Images. For this Pope was the firſt that confirm'd *Image-Worſhip*; which the Editors ſeem to ſtrengthen with Abundance of Integrity by Arguments drawn from Holy-Scripture; but very ſtrangely perverſe, and moſt diſingenuouſly applied. Pope *Hadrian* I. a great Stickler for this new Doctrine, in his Epiſtle to *Charlemaine*, argues thus: *In the Book of* Exodus, ch. 25. *we read, That the Lord ſpake to* Moſes, *ſaying, Speak unto the Children of* Iſrael, *that they receive an Offering for me: Of every Man whoſe Heart giveth it freely, ye ſhall take the Offering for me. And thus is the Offering which ye ſhall take for me.* And ſo on to the 18th Verſe, *And thou ſhalt make two Cherubims,* &c. [The other Argument is taken from the 1 *Kings, c.* 6. *v.* 23. *And within the Oracle he made two Cherubims of Olive-Tree,* &c.] and in Verſe 29. *And he carved all the Walls of the Houſe round about with graven Figures of Cherubims, and of Palm Trees, and of graven Flowers within and without,* &c. But *Hadrian* goes on in the ſame Epiſtle thus: *Let us conſider, beloved Brethren, what* Moſes *did at the Command of the Lord, and that wiſe Prince* Solomon, *when by an expreſs Order from God's own Mouth, he built the Houſe of the Lord. With how pure a Heart and Mind then ought we to worſhip the Carved Images of Chriſt our God, his Holy Mother the Virgin* Mary, *the Apoſtles, and all the Bleſſed Saints of God, whoſe propitious Interceſſion may gain us Forgiveneſs of Sins?* This is, I think, a Parcel of the moſt prophane Inferences that the wicked Heart of Man could invent or draw from any Authority; beſides, nothing could be ever pitch'd upon ſo repugnant to the Letter of the Holy

ly Scriptures as they are. The firſt Argument Pope *Hadrian* uſes is nothing to the Purpoſe; for when God commanded *Moſes* and the Children of *Iſrael to make Cherubs of Gold*, he did not command them to worſhip them, no more than he did *Solomon*; the Variety of carved Images were for Ornament, not for Worſhip. Except they will invert and change the Words, (which in their *Latin* Bibles they are expert at, as Dr. *James* well obſerves) and inſtead of God's bidding them *Make Cherubims*, to *Worſhip Cherubims*. They have done as bad as this amounts to, as may plainly be ſeen in the Variety and Contrariety of the vulgar *Latin* Bibles, in Dr. *James*'s *Corrupt. &c. p.* 272, *&c.* But what a Contradiction do they make God Almighty guilty of in his own Acts, particularly in the Second Commandment? Where in a moſt ſolemn Manner, and as a Law to laſt for ever, he obliges us not to *Worſhip or fall down before any carved or graven Image*; aſſerting the Right of Worſhip to be due only to him. Notwithſtanding all this, *Labbé* and *Coſſart*, *T.* 6. *p.* 1460, 1461. pretend to ſhew from many Teſtimonies, That the Worſhip of Holy Images was received in the Church very anciently.

In the Year 726, the Emperor *Leo*, to put a Stop to the growing of *Image-Worſhip*, and to take off the Scandal which it gave the *Mahometans* and *Jews*, prudently called a Council, wherein it was decreed, that Images ſhould be removed out of the Churches, or at leaſt be ſet higher out of Sight.

This Decree he ſends into *Italy* to Pope *Gregory*, to have his Conſent and Confirmation of it. Who, inſtead of complying with the Emperor, this Year, or the next, in a Council at *Rome*, excommunicates the Emperor, condemns all Oppoſers of *Image-Worſhip*, juſtifying it to be agreeable to the Practice of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*. (O horrid Impiety and

Blaſphemy!) In his Letters circular, he charges the Emperor with the higheſt Impiety, calls him an Enemy to the Chriſtian Religion, and unworthy of the Empire; forbids every one, upon Pain of the moſt heavy *Interdict*, to pay any Taxes to him, abſolves all People in *Italy* from paying any Allegiance to him, forbids Images to be removed out of Churches, and cauſes the Emperor, in his Statues, to be moſt vilely affronted by the Mob. He excommunicates *Paulus Patricius* the Viceroy, who was ſent to apprehend and bring him to *Conſtantinople*; ſides with, and calls to his Aſſiſtance the *Barbarous* People who were in Poſſeſſion of *Italy*; and, wherever he finds any Thing belonging to the Emperor, he ſeizes upon it as lawful Plunder. A very hopeful Son of the Church, and loyal Subject! Not only to fly in the Face of his Sovereign, but to ſide with Infidels againſt him, and provoke his Subjects to rebel. Theſe vile Actions the Editors are ſo far from being aſham'd of, that Cardinal *Baronius*, *ad An.* 730, *n.* 5. juſtifies Pope *Gregory*. *When* Gregory, ſays he, *could by no Means make the Emperor deſiſt from his Reſolution, he look'd upon the Time as come, that the Ax was laid to this unfruitful Tree, and that it called to the Apoſtolick Authority to cut it down. Which thundering Stroke ſo rous'd the* Weſtern *Chriſtians, that they immediately revolt from* Leo, *and take Part with the Pope.* (Little thinking how hard he and his pious Succeſſors would ride them.) But *Baronius* goes on: *Thus* Gregory *left a noble Example to Poſterity, to teach them not to ſuffer an heretical Prince in the Church of Chriſt.* A pious Encomium to be beſtow'd upon an Idolater and a Rebel.

But for Fear theſe boiſterous Doings ſhould make *Gregory* look more like a *Bully* than a Pope, they tell us, That this very *Gregory*, hearing *Luitprand* King of the *Lombards* was marching to *Rome*, met him,

him, and by his pious Eloquence ſo ſoften'd him, that at St. *Peter*'s Altar he diveſted himſelf of all his Royal Apparel, and with them offer'd his very Sword and Crown to the Memory of that Apoſtle. Here's a Turn! The Scene chang'd in a Moment; the Lion turn'd into a Lamb; and bluſtring Pope *Gregory* transform'd into a ſupplicant Biſhop. How wretched is the State of thoſe Men that muſt ſubmit, againſt their Reaſon, to theſe Impoſtures, or ſuffer the Cenſure againſt Hereticks to paſs upon them?

The Editors are in a great Confuſion about the Epiſtles of this Pope; for thoſe Two Epiſtles, which are in *Greek* and *Latin*, among the Acts of the Second Council of *Nice*, in *Labbe*'s Opinion do not belong to this Pope, but to *Gregory* III. And *Sirmondus* thinks, that the Firſt Epiſtle, which is to *Boniface* the Archbiſhop, belongs properly to *Gregory* III. for *Gratian* aſcribes it to *Gregory* III. Beſides, the Mention made in it of the *Pall* ſent to *Boniface*, declares it to be ſo; for the Author of the Life of *Boniface*, *l.* 1. *c.* 31. affirms the Pall to be ſent by *Gregory* III.

Gregory II. having ſo ſucceſsfully carried on the Cauſe of *Image-Worſhip*, is carefully imitated by his Succeſſor,

[731.] *Gregory* III. who treads in his Steps, and is no leſs ſtrenuous in it; for he thunders out his *Anathema's* againſt all Oppoſers of *Image-Worſhip*, goes on in withdrawing *Italy* from the Empire of the *Greeks*, and annexes to the Church, in the Name of St. *Peter*, all Demeſnes of the Emperor about *Rome*. In the Beginning of his *Pontificate* he ſent *Commonitory Letters* to the Emperor *Leo*, about reſtoring Images to the Churches: But *Gregory* the Presbyter, who was ſent on that Errand, not daring to deliver the Letters, return'd *re infectâ*:

For which he is ſummon'd before a Synod, and with great Difficulty eſcaped Depoſition. However, he is ſent again on the ſame Buſineſs to *Conſtantinople*; but the Emperor ſtops him by the Way in *Sicily*, takes his Letters from him, and baniſhes him: Which was no ſooner known at *Rome*, but the Pope ſtorms; and calling a Synod, again pouring out his *Anathema's* againſt the Enemies of *Image-Worſhip*, publiſhes a notable Decree in Defence of it. At the ſame Time he ſends from the Synod *Conſtantine* the *Advocate*, and the Year after *Peter* the *Advocate*, on the ſame Errand; whom the Emperor rewarded as he had done *Gregory* the *Presbyter*: In the Height of which Diſpute Pope *Gregory* dies.

It is here worthy our Conſideration, How happy might the Church have been under the Patronage and Protection of ſeveral pious Emperors and Kings, if it had not been attacked by its own more immediate Members? But it too often and prophetically has been verified, that her greateſt Enemies ſhould be thoſe of her own Houſhold. Nor can any Infidel be ſuppos'd ſo dangerous an Enemy as a Heretick; for the Church entire cannot fall; the Gates of Hell cannot prevail againſt her: But when ſhe is divided, ſhe is liable to all Storms and Attempts.

[757.] Pope *Paul* I. was another Friend to the *Image-Worſhipers*, and teaz'd the Emperor *Conſtantine* with frequent Embaſſies, to perſuade him to reſtore Images to the Churches.

This Pope has a whole Bundle of Epiſtles, after the uſual Cuſtom, laid to him; though there is as little Credit to be given to them as to any of the former: And any one, I believe, will think ſo, when he finds Ten out of Twelve juſtly liable to be queſtion'd for their Want of Date: And that which

which adds to the Suſpicion is, that the Eleventh Epiſtle is dated the 40th Year of the Emperor *Conſtantine*; and the 12th, the 41ſt; which was ſeveral Years after Pope *Paul* was dead. Beſides, this *Conſtantine* reign'd but 34 Years: But if it were to go according to the Date of the Epiſtles, one was dated 13, the other 14 Years after Pope *Paul*'s Death. If the Editors had ſtudied to make the Popes ridiculous, they could not have taken a more effectual Method.

[772.] Pope *Hadrian* was a famous Stickler in the old Cauſe of *Image-Worſhip*; which he defends in a long Epiſtle to the Emperor *Conſtantine* and his Mother the Empreſs *Irene*: Which Epiſtle is ſtuff'd with moſt pitiful Argument, fabulous Proofs, and Teſtimonies of the Holy Scriptures and Fathers moſt violently diſtorted, and improperly applied. And at laſt he writes an Epiſtle, or ſmall Book, in Anſwer to *Charlemain*, in Defence of the infamous Second Council of *Nice*: Of which it is neceſſary to take ſome Notice, being held about this ſame Argument, for which the Papiſts ſo much contend; as alſo of that memorable Council of *Frankford*, which condemn'd the Second *Nicene* Council. And of theſe Two Councils no Writer ſpeaks more conciſely and ingenuouſly than our Countryman, Sir *Hen. Spelman*.

" A moſt remarkable, but melancholy Diſpute " aroſe about this Time in the Church of God; " which being variouſly controverted in the Eaſt, " according to the Inclination of the Emperors, " ſome being againſt *Image-Worſhip*, ſome for it, at " laſt, by the artful Menage of the Empreſs *Irene*, " at the Inſtigation of Pope *Hadrian*, the *Image-Worſhipers* carried their Point; and " in the Second Council of *Nice* got 788, *al.* 789. " their Idolatrous Doctrine confirm'd; the Acts of

" which

" which Council were ſent from *Conſtantinople* to " *Charlemain* King of *France*, not as yet Emperor; " which he forthwith ſends over into *Britain* to " *Offa* King of the *Mercians*, and his Biſhops, to be " obſerved. This ſtrange Doctrine ſtruck the " Church of *Britain* with Amazement: But *Alcuin* " (the then Glory of the *Britiſh* Commonwealth of " Learning) writes an Epiſtle to *Charlemain*, in " the Name of the Biſhops and Kings of *England*; " wherein, by true Authorities drawn from Scrip- " ture and the Fathers, which he dextrouſly, but " faithfully, applied, he quite confuted and de- " ſtroyed the new Scheme of Worſhip; and by " Strength of Reaſon ſo prevailed with *Charle-* " *main*, that in the Year 794, he call'd a Council " at *Frankford*, where, in the Preſence of above " 300 Biſhops, the Decrees of the 2d Council of " *Nice* are condemn'd." *Vid. Spelm. T.* 1. *ad an.* 789.

There is a great Diſpute among the Editors about the Priority and Legitimacy too of the Councils about the End of the Eighth Century, which were either for or againſt the Doctrine of *Image-Worſhip*. But conſidering the Inſincerity of the *Romaniſts*, I ſhall rely upon our own Countrymen, *Alcuin*, *Spelman*, Biſhop *Beveridge*, *&c.* whoſe faithful and ingenuous Dealing in this Point makes the Truth very conſpicuous.

In the Year 754, there was a Council held at *Conſtantinople*, which call'd it ſelf the *Seventh General Council*; which pronounc'd Excommunication againſt all thoſe who ſhould not receive it as the *Seventh General Council*. And taking the Cauſe of *Image-Worſhip* into Conſideration, they condemn'd it as abominable; decreeing all Images, of what Matter or Colour ſoever made, to be caſt out of all Chriſtian Churches, and ſevere Puniſhments to be

be inflicted upon thoſe who ſhould make or worſhip any Image, either in Churches or in private Houſes; *viz.* if the Perſon offending was Biſhop, Prieſt, or Deacon, he was to be depos'd; but if a Monk or Layman, to be excommunicated, and be liable to the Puniſhment of the Imperial Laws, as an Enemy to the Commandment of God, and the Opinion of the Holy Fathers of the Church. Then was the Matter controverted in private, each *Party*, according to the Strength of their Intereſt, carrying their Point; till (as has been ſaid) in the Second *Nicene* Council the *Image-Worſhipers* publickly eſtabliſhed their Doctrine: Which did not hold long without Controverſy; for the *Frankford* Council decreed directly oppoſite to it in theſe Words: *The Queſtion being mov'd about the new Synod which the* Greek *Church had call'd at* Conſtantinople, *concerning the Worſhiping of Images, in which it is decreed, That they who will not pay the ſame Worſhip and Adoration to the Images of Saints that they do to the* Deific Trinity, *ſhall be excommunicated: Which Adoration and Worſhip, the Holy Fathers aſſembled, deſpiſe and condemn.* Beveridg. Annot. in Con. Nic. 11.

The Editors, indeed, pretend a Decree of the Second Council of *Nice* for deifying of Images; but whatever *Binius* may aſſert, Biſhop *Beveridge* declares he could never find it. But if there had been ſuch a Decree, Pope *Hadrian* was more cunning than to own it; (which ſhews what a raſh hot-headed *Spark* this *Binius* is:) For he ſoftens the Expreſſion, and minces the Matter daintily, by ſaying, *Far be it from us to deify Images, (as ſome fooliſhly prattle;) for it is only Affection and Love toward God and his Saints that we pretend; making Uſe of Images no otherwiſe than Holy Books to repreſent their Memory.* Had the Fathers of the *Frankford* Council known this, they had look'd upon it but a poor Subter-

Subterfuge, and had notwithſtanding condemn'd the Doctrine.

But here follows a fine Fetch of *Binius*, to invalidate and leſſen the Proceedings of this Council. *It is a great Queſtion* (ſays he) *among the moſt learned Men of that Age, Whether the Second* Nicene *Council was condemn'd by the Fathers of the* Frankford *or not; for ſome deny it, and others affirm it?* And yet tho' he owns, that his Two Oracles, *Baronius* and *Bellarmine*, are of Opinion, That this Council of *Nice* was condemn'd by the *Frankford* Fathers, he has the Impudence to inſinuate, That when he conſiders that the Acts of that Council never came to Light, he does not ſee how any Thing could be ſaid to be done againſt *Image-Worſhip*: Nay, he does not ſtick to ſay but that they confirm'd it: And is very buſy to make the World believe, that his Two illuſtrious Cardinals in other Places unſay what they had ſaid before. But he muſt have loſt his Eyes that cannot ſee into this Cheat; or, if he will not, deſerves to forfeit the Uſe of them.

Undoubtedly they took the Advantage of the Loſs of the Acts of the *Frankford*-Council, which ſo ſtrenuouſly oppos'd *Image-Worſhip*; nothing of them remaining but our Countryman *Alcuin*'s excellent Epiſtle.

In the next Century, the better to promote the Worſhiping of Images, and that nothing in Holy Scipture ſhould ſeem to diſagree with the Second *Nicene* Council, the Second Commandment, which forbids the Worſhiping of Graven Images, is taken out of the Decalogue; and, to keep up the Number, the Tenth Commandment is divided: *Thou ſhalt not covet thy Neighbour's Houſe*, ſupplies the Room of the Ninth; and, *Thou ſhalt not covet thy Neighbour's Wife, nor his Servant, nor his Maid, nor his*

his Ox, nor his Aſs, nor any Thing that is his, makes the Tenth. *See Spelman, T.* 1. *ut ſupr.*

The Council aforementioned, which was held at *Conſtantinople* in the Year 754, is by *Labbé* call'd, *Conciliabulum Conſtantinopolitanum Pſeudoſeptimum, &c. the little ſham General Council of* Conſtantinople, *conſiſting of* 300 *Biſhops, and call'd by* Copronymus *againſt the Uſe of Holy Images.* What Nonſenſe in Terms is this Title? firſt to call it *Little,* when it conſiſted of 300 Biſhops, and which he calls *General*: Next, it was call'd by the Emperor *Conſtantine Copronymus,* who had Power to call a Synod. Beſides, this Council had all the Marks of a General Council elſe, for there were Two Eminent Metropolitans that preſided in it, *Theodoſius* Biſhop of *Epheſus,* and *Viceroy* of the *Eaſt,* and *Siſinnius* Metropolitan of *Pergas*; the See of *Conſtantinople* being at that Time vacant; and other Patriarchs groaning under the heavy Yoke of the *Saracens.* The Biſhop of *Rome* had no Legate in this Council; and truly now it was as little neceſſary as reaſonable; for the Weſtern People had revolted from the Eaſtern Emperor, eſpecially the City of *Rome* and all *Italy,* at the Inſtigation of this Pope.

The Title of the Council of *Frankford,* by *Labbé* and *Coſſart,* is one of the moſt ridiculous Impoſtures they could have fram'd, for they ſay, *That the Acts of the Second* Nicene *Council, in the Caſe of Images, were here confirm'd.* Labb. T. 7. p. 1013. How unlikely this is, let the Reader judge by the Deſign of *Charlemain's* calling this Council; for he, being rouz'd by *Alcuin's* Letter in the Name of the Biſhops and Kings of *Britain,* which was a Confutation of the Acts of the *Second* Nicene *Council,* forthwith calls this Synod of *Frankford,* in order to condemn the Acts of the *Second Synod* of *Nice*: Which they did; and yet the Editors have the Aſ-

ſurance

ſurance to ſay in the Title, That *Image-Worſhip* was here confirmed, at the ſame Time that it was actually condemn'd.

But I would fain know with what Face they could do thus, ſince it is impoſſible to have a clearer Account of the Acts of the *Frankford-Council*, than from thoſe Four Books call'd *Libri Carolini*: And this we ſhall find worth our Enquiring into. As to theſe Four Books, though they are call'd *Charlemain*'s, it's thought they were not the Product of his own Brain, but were written by ſome learned Man or Men, who were to bear a Part in this Synod; and that they were confirm'd and approv'd by him. (*Spelman* and others are of Opinion, that *Alcuin* was the Author, and very probable, for none underſtood the Argument better, or was more able to defend the Cauſe againſt Images than he.) But whoever was the Author of the Books, they were approved by *Charlemain*, and by him ſent to *Hadrian* then Pope.

Upon this all the Advocates of the Pontificate are in Arms, every one drawing his Pen to give the Authority of theſe Books a Stab. *Poſſevin* boldly affirms they could not be *Charlemain*'s, becauſe *Hadrian* wrote againſt them to *Charlemain*; from whence (ſays he) it's plain they were written by ſome Heretick, and by *Charlemain* were ſent to the Pope to anſwer them. *Cabbaſutius*, in his *Eccleſ. Notitia*, *p.* 320. plays the Juggler indeed, for he draws Arguments both from the *Oppoſers* and *Worſhipers* of *Images*, to invalidate their Authority; with many more to the ſame Purpoſe.

And now it is Time to enquire into the ſubject Matter of theſe Books, of which none gives a handſomer Account than the ingenious and learned Dr. *Cave*, *Hiſt. Lit. Par.* 1. *pag.* 264. *Par.* 2. *pag.* 490, 491, 492.

1. The

1. The Firſt Book contains a Preface, and ſome Exceptions to the Emperor *Conſtantine*'s and his Mother the Empreſs *Irene*'s Letters; and the Texts of Scripture which the *Nicene Image-Worſhipers* perverſely abuſe, in Defence of their Doctrine, are ſtrictly examined, and their vain and abſurd Interpretations of them expos'd.

2. In the Second Book, more Texts of Scripture, and Paſſages of the Fathers, quoted by the *Nicene* Champions, are examin'd; and by diſtinguiſhing between *Civil* and *Religious* Worſhip, it is plainly demonſtrated how falſe their Reaſonings are.

3. In the Third Book, after a Confeſſion of Faith, the dangerous Opinions and abſurd Arguments of ſeveral Biſhops in the *Nicene* Council, not only in Matters of Faith, (eſpecially about the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt) but of Images, and the Manner of worſhiping them, and concerning the Miracles pretended to be produced in Confirmation of them, are diſcuſs'd.

4. The Fourth Book conſiſts of the ſame Argument; more Parts of the Acts of the *Nicene Council* being queſtion'd; and concludes with this, *viz.* That the *Nicene Council* is improperly call'd *General*, becauſe the Doctrine and Tradition of the Catholick Church was not conſtituted and obſerved in it. This is the Sum of *Charlemain*'s Books.

There is one Thing further remarkable about theſe Books. They are not to be found in any Editions of the Tomes of the Councils, nor among *Baluzius*'s *Capitulars*, I ſuppoſe, leſt their People ſhould be convinced by them. But the more Sanguine *Pontificate*-Champions boldly deny them to be genuine: Nay, they are ſo mad, as to affirm that they were written either by *Carolſtad*, or by ſome other *Lutheran* or *Calviniſt*. Whereas

it

it is plain, that *John Filius*, a rigid Advocate of the Papacy, firſt publiſhed them from a very ancient Copy, which agrees exactly with that old Copy in the *Vatican* Library. And yet, right or wrong, theſe Books, though own'd by the moſt learned and beſt Men of their own Party, muſt be ſpurious, becauſe they flie in the Face of their idolatrous and heretical Poſitions. But the Force of Truth is too great and powerful to ſubmit to their weak and ridiculous Aſſertions, which in no Age could ſtand the Teſt.

As to the Acts of this Council, there were Two Things chiefly tranſacted in it:

1. The Hereſy of *Elepandus* and *Felix*, who affirm'd the Son of God to be *adoptive*, was condemn'd. See the Epiſtles of Pope *Hadrian*, of the Biſhops of *Italy*, *Gaul*, and *Germany*, to the Biſhops of *Spain*; and of *Charlemain* to *Elipandus*, *Labb.* and *Coſſart*, *T.* 7. *p.* 1014. Theſe likewiſe, and other Monuments relating to *Felix*'s Caſe, Cardinal *d'Aguerre* hath in *Conſil. Hiſp. T.* 3. *p.* 91.

2. The Caſe of *Image-Worſhip* was here controverted; and 'twas concluded, That Images might remain in the Church for Ornament, and Remembrance-Sake; but that all Worſhip and Adoration ſhould abſolutely be aboliſh'd. The Acts of the *Second Council of Nice*, for Worſhiping of Images, were condemn'd. All the Texts of Scripture, and Teſtimonies out of the Fathers, perverſely uſed in their Defence, are carefully and ſtrictly examin'd, and all their Sophiſtry and Tricks detected, and ſolidly refuted. Whence they decreed, That this Synod ought not to be call'd a *General* One, nor to be reckon'd ſo much as the Seventh; nor is it call'd by the Writers of that Time by any other Name than that of a *Sham-Synod*. *Vid. Cav. Par.* 2. *p.* 264.

[795.] The Papacy of *Leo* III. is very diverting, and ſurprizing too; and they that love Romance may in the Life of this Pope have their Fill. *Binius*, like a tender-conſcienc'd Writer, cannot forbear telling an idle Story, though he rejects it as a Forgery when he has done. The Story is this: *In the Beginning of his Pontificate*, Leo *paſſing along, a Woman kiſs'd his Hand, which Kiſs ſet the Fleſh on Fire, ſo that he was forc'd to have it cut off; and from that Time, inſtead of kiſſing the Pope's Hand, they were oblig'd to kiſs his Foot.* As if the Foot of a Pope was Fire-Proof more than the Hand. Now in my Opinion, *Binius* might have ſav'd himſelf the Trouble of rejecting this Story, by not telling it. But ſince he is for rejecting Fables, I wonder he would not go on, and paſs by that idle and incredible Story of Pope *Leo* III. having his Eyes and his Tongue cut out of his Head, and afterwards having them miraculouſly reſtor'd to him. This is in my Opinion as ridiculous as any Thing can be told: And *Anaſtaſius* tells us, *Binius* might with as much Security have rejected it, as he did the former. But to ſpeak the plain Truth, if it was not for the Number of Fictions and Forgeries, the Lives of all the Popes hitherto would make but a ſmall Volume. *Labb. &c. T.* 7. *p.* 1075. *to p.* 1109. is taken up with the Life of this Pope, and *Binius*'s Notes on it; where, beſides the *Romances* already mention'd, you have ſeveral of the Editors moſt affected fundamental Topicks; particularly that darling one of the Biſhops of *Rome*'s Diſpoſing of Kingdoms and Crowns, *&c. Binius*, in his Note upon the Paſſage of *Leo*'s crowning *Charlemain* Emperor at *Rome*, is not a little peeviſh, ſaying, *None but an obſtinate Heretick will deny ſo celebrated a Story.* And *Labbé* and *Coſſart* in the Margin, *p.* 1108. wheedlingly inſinuate, *That Pope* Leo, *by*

 undoubted

undoubted Right, transferred the Imperial Crown from the Greeks *to* Charles *King of the* Franks, *and his Heirs.* But there is a great deal of Difference between aſſerting and proving: And, as peeviſh and poſitive as they are, I muſt take Leave to ask them, from whence they derive this Power of transferring Kingdoms from one Prince to another? And ſince I know they cannot anſwer for themſelves, I ſhall only add, That 'tis very unlikely that thoſe Popes ſhould have a Right to diſpoſe of or tranſfer Kingdoms from one to another, who were Supplicants for Help to thoſe Princes to whom they pretend to transfer Crowns; and had no more Hand in diſpoſing of the Crown they handled at the Inauguration of a King, than any Biſhop may be ſaid to have when he performs the Office at a King's Coronation. But in another Senſe indeed, they may be ſaid to have diſpoſed (I do not ſay juſtly) of Kingdoms, *&c.* for from the Beginning of *Gregory* II.'s Pontificate, to the Time of *Charlemain*'s being crown'd Emperor at *Rome*, the Popes made it their Buſineſs to alienate the Weſtern Empire from the Emperors of the Eaſt, who would not countenance and confirm their *Image-Worſhip*, till at laſt, as in this Pope's Time, the Weſtern Empire in general revolted, and *Charlemain* was crown'd Emperor of the Weſt by *Leo* III.

Of the Thirteen Epiſtles which are aſcribed to this Pope, Nine of them, *viz.* from the Second to the 12th, are publiſhed by *Hermannus Conringius*, at *Helmſtadt*, 1655. in which the blind Sides of this Pope are laid open; and therefore *Labbé* and *Coſſart*, in *p.* 1113. in the Margin, ſay, *After the uſual Manner of Hereticks, he cannot forbear calumniating the Holy Catholick Church, and her Supreme Biſhop.*

The Thirteenth Epiſtle, to *Richulphus* Biſhop of *Mentz*, is a pretty Diſcovery of the *Roman* Pontiff's trading

trading in *Relicks*: For he thanks *Richulphus*, who had ſent his Preſent firſt, and then tells him he had ſent him the *Relicks* which he had deſired. This Epiſtle indeed, by the Menage of it, looks like authentick: And yet the Editors affirm this Epiſtle to be publiſhed, *A. D.* 1605. by *Serarius*, among St. *Boniface*'s Epiſtles, *Numb.* 75. But this may be, and yet the Epiſtle be *Leo*'s; for it is very common with the Editors to publiſh one Epiſtle in ſeveral Places, and range it where Occaſion moſt requires, then it ſerves a real Turn. *Labb. & Coſſart, T.* 7. *p.* 1127.

The Editors tell us, *Labb. &c. T.* 7. *p.* 1158. there was a Synod call'd at *Rome*, but they do not ſay by whom, though the Emperor *Charlemain* was preſent at it: And it is very improbable *Leo* III. call'd it, becauſe it was in his own Caſe. But it is worth while to obſerve their Cunning, for they have long ſince left off that imperious Way of ſaying, That a Council, be it where it would, was call'd by the Pope: But the Title of this runs plainly thus: *A* Roman *Synod in the Caſe of Pope* Leo *gather'd in the Preſence of* Charlemain, *A. D.* 800. *and of Pope* Leo III. *An.* 5. *Upon this Council,* Binius's *Notes are very diverting. In the Year* 800. (ſays he) Charlemain *came to* Rome, *to put an End to thoſe wicked Factions which had ſo long diſturb'd the Church, and to reſtore her to her ancient Security. Upon which, a Synod is ſummon'd, and the Pope commands* (mark the Word) *the Biſhops then preſent to be Judges in his Cauſe, and the Crimes objected againſt him; though he very well knew the Apoſtolick See to be ſubject to no Judge. And when no Body could prove the Crimes objected againſt him, by invoking the Divine Diety, he canonically purg'd himſelf.* And for all this, we have (ſays *Binius*) the ſingle Authority of *Anaſtaſius*. But let us examine theſe Things.

As to the Perſon that called this Council, (if there was one, for truly I can ſee no Occaſion for any) it undoubtedly muſt be *Charlemain*, according to *Binius*, from *Anaſtaſius*'s own Words: Charlemain *cauſed the Archbiſhops and Biſhops, Abbots, noble* Franks *and* Romans, *to meet in the Church, Labb. ut ſupra.* Here the Editors have a little outſhot themſelves, for they make the Emperor call a Council under the Supreme Judge's Noſe.

As to the Occaſion of this Synod, I muſt confeſs, I am to ſeek; nor do the Editors give the leaſt Light into it, either in their Notes, or in the Form of the Pope's *Purgation.* They only in general tell us, That he was accuſed of grievous Crimes, but mention neither the Crimes nor the Accuſers.

The Method of the Pope's chooſing his Judges is very prepoſterous and ridiculous, beſides improble; for if he ſtood accuſed of any Crimes, the Power that conven'd the Synod ought to appoint the Judges. But then the pretty Manner of doing this! *He commanded the Biſhops then preſent to judge him.* Abundance of Juſtice to be expected from Judges of the Criminal's own Chooſing! But here ariſes another unlucky Contradiction, which, if *Binius* had not been very fond of his own Scribbling, he would have omitted. And that is this: The Editors in general are the moſt ſtrenuous Aſſerters of the *Supremacy* and *Infallibility*, amongſt whom none are more warm than *Binius*; yet here he deſtroys it, and pretends to revive it again: For if the Pope were liable to no Judicature, why ſhould he ſubmit to a Tryal before a Synod. But *Binius* very weakly endeavours to take this off, by ſaying, *Though he knew he was ſubject to no Judgment.* Indeed, I think they had better have left out this Sham Council, (for as ſuch I cannot but take it) than for the Sake of Scribbling foiſt in a Council

to

to expoſe their Biſhop, and deſtroy his Supremacy. Thus when Fancy outruns it ſelf, it degenerates into downright Lying.

During the Pontificate of *Leo* III. *Paulinus* Biſhop of *Aquileia* called a Council at *Altinum*; which being met, wrote a Synodal Epiſtle to the Emperor *Charlemain*, complaining of *John* Duke of *Venice*, and imploring his Help to puniſh him for the Murder of *John* Patriarch of *Grande*.

By the Title of this Council, *Lab. T.* 7. *p.* 1187. the Editors began to be either weary or aſham'd of impoſing on the World. For they only ſay of Pope *Leo*, that this Council was called in his Time, not under him, or by his Command, as uſually; but nakedly own the Truth, and ſay it was called by the *Command of Paulinus*; the Pope being no otherwiſe mentioned, than as it was in his Time. By which we may ſee, rather than not be mentioned in a Council, they will have the Pope at the Head of a Council, tho' he has nothing to do there; or if it be only to take Place of the Emperor, before whom they place him.

In the Year 806, the firſt *Conſtantinopolitan* Council in this Century, is by the Editors entitled in the Time of Pope *Leo* III. But I cannot ſee any Reaſon they have (except it be that nothing Good or Bad muſt paſs without the Knowledge or Conſent of their Biſhop) to take any Cognizance of the Pope having any Thing to do in a Council, which they call a *Council of Hereticks and Adulterers*; for ſuch *Theodore Studita*, in his 25th and 30th Epiſtles to Pope *Leo*, calls it. *Labb. &c. T.* 7. *p.* 1191, 1192. and gives this Reaſon for it, *Becauſe the Biſhops that met there, connived at and approved the Adultery of the Emperor* Conſtantine *with* Theodoree, *and eſpous'd the Intereſt of* Joſeph, whom he calls *Adulterii Copulatorem*. Upon this *Joſeph*'s Account this Council

was called; who, having been some Time before deprived, was now restored. But here their Tenderness in saying it was only called in Pope *Leo*'s Time, may do them some Service, because the Case was scandalous, and that he acted no Part in it. But then they might better have left his Name quite out of the Title, which would have cleared him altogether; which they do not care to do, because no Council, by their Consent, either Heretical or Orthodox, shall pass without the Pope in the Top of it.

The Second *Constantinopolitan* Council, which was held about the same Affair as the First, *A. D.* 809. carries *Leo*'s Name in the Title as the former doth. And tho' the Editors own, That *Theodore*, in his Epistles to Pope *Leo* III. sets forth the Acts of these Councils as black and infamous as they deserved to be; yet I cannot find any Reply to countenance *Theodore*, or condemn those vile Decrees which these Councils made in Behalf of the adulterous Emperor, tho' nothing could be plainer than his Adultery; for he took *Theodoree* to Wife, his lawful Wife being alive at the same Time, whom he had confin'd to a Monastery. Besides, that infamous Decree of this Second Council, (if he could have pretended to any Power over them) was highly worth his Cognizance; for they decreed in Favour of the Emperor *Constantine*, *That Divine Laws in Opposition to Kings were of no Force; and that they, who in this Case, in Imitation of St.* John Baptist *and St.* Chrysostome, *shed their Blood for Truth and Righteousness Sake, were not to be called Martyrs.* Here was a glorious Opportunity of *Leo*'s exerting himself in the Defence of Truth against such Profaneness; whom if by his commonitory Letters (for his Power as yet extended no further) he could not restrain, he might easily have called in the Assistance of the

pious

pious Emperor *Charlemain*, to put a Stop to this dangerous Evil in a General Council. But inſtead of this, the Editors will have this Pope's Name at the Head of theſe Councils, tho' inſignificantly; for they find him no Buſineſs or Power in them; and tho' importun'd by *Theodore*, he tamely paſſes by all Occurrencies in them.

In the Year 813, there were Five Councils called by the immediate Commmand of the Emperor *Charlemain*; which is expreſly mentioned by the Editors in the Titles of each of them; *viz.* That of *Arles*, *Mentz*, *Rhemes*, *Turenne*, and *Chalon*. And which *J. Sirmondus* and *Binius* in their Notes confirm. *Labb. &c. T.* 7. *p.* 1239. and ſo on; tho' the Pope is no where mentioned either in the Acts or Canons of theſe Councils, except in the Titles of them; where the Year of his Pontificate is placed before the Year of the Emperor's Reign; which is with no other Deſign than to give the Pope the upper Hand of the Emperor; for it is plain the Pope was not conſulted in the Matters of theſe Councils, moſt of the Canons of them being taken from the *Carthaginian* Councils of a far ancienter Date; with no other Deſign than to revive the Diſcipline of the Primitive Church, which the Patriarchs of *Rome* had too much neglected; and had lain longer dormient, but for the pious Care of the Emperor *Charlemain*, and thoſe excellent *Gallican* Prelates who excited him to the promoting of ſo good a Work.

The Council of *Turenne*, which was one of the Five Councils called by the Emperor *Charlemain*, in the 17th Canon condemns the modern Practice of the Church of *Rome*, of *Praying in an unknown Tongue*. For this Canon, injoining the *Biſhops to have Homilies furniſh'd with neceſſary Admonitions for the Inſtruction of the People*, further adds, *That they*

ſhould tranſlate them into the common Roman *Tongue, that every one might the more eaſily underſtand them.*

The Editors pretend a Council at *Conſtantinople*, in the Year 814, in Favour of the old Topick *Image-Worſhip*. Wherein they ſuppoſe *Nicephorus* the Patriarch, and 170 Biſhops, condemn'd *Antony* Metropolitan of *Sila*, (the great Enemy to Images, and the Emperor *Leo*'s chief Inſtrument in deſtroying them) excommunicated him and his Aſſociates, and re-eſtabliſh'd and confirm'd the Worſhip of Images. The Story of this Council is contained in a Synodical Epiſtle or Oration, by an anonymous Author; and is ſo ſtuff'd with ridiculous idle Fables, that no *Roman Legend* can exceed it. The Account of *Leo*'s conſulting a Magician is an idle old Woman's Tale, and fit for nothing but to entertain Children with, who delight to hear of Inchanters and Hobgoblins, and ſuch frightful Things. Certainly no Adverſary of the modern Practices of the Church of *Rome* could ever do her ſo much Miſchief, and bring ſuch Diſcredit upon her as theſe idle Tales. But that which confirms me in the Opinion that this Council either was a Sham One, or abuſively named inſtead of another, or put in by the Editors to ſerve a Turn, is the Collection of Canons which they father upon this Council. But before we enter upon Examination of theſe Canons, it will not be unpleaſant to hear what *Labbe*'s Obſervation ſays of this Council and its Canons. *T. 7. p.* 1290. *Before we look toward* Greece, (ſays he) *and with* Baronius, Binius, *and others*, (excellent Company, and good at Diſcoveries!) *ſhew the State of that Heretical Synod of Image-haters, let us take Notice of that General Council held at* Conſtantinople *by* Nicephorus, *and other Holy Men, againſt* Antony *Metropolitan of* Sila; *the Account of which we ſhall take from the ſynodical Epiſtle of ſome* Eaſtern *Prelates to the*

Empe-

Emperor Theophilus, *which was publish'd first by* Combefisius, *&c.* Indeed by this and such like Accounts as these, *Labbé* has very much lessen'd my Opinion of him; and the further I enquire into him, the more unsincere and trifling I find him. A greater Instance of which there cannot be than this very last Observation of his. For in his Recommendation of *Baronius* and *Binius* for Discoverers of Truth, he may not improperly be said to *pull himself by the Nose*; for it is somewhat absurd to commend them for faithful Guides, and Followers of Truth, who have so often gone astray, and whom he himself hath often convicted of notorious Errors and Untruths. Well, much Good do him with his hopeful Company.

In the next Place, I would fain know how any Writing can be called *Authentick*, which wants the Name of the Author; and, by Vertue of this Authority, he calls it a *General Council*; tho' in the Title (and of his own giving) he calls it, *The Council of* Constantinople. To which foresaid Account of this Council, he says, he has added the Canons which are inserted by *Leunclave*, *L.* 3. *T.* 1. *p.* 190. and therefore they must pass for genuine; especially because they are thrust into the Body of the *Canon-Law*. But this is not the first Cheat in this Kind which the Editors, *Gratian* and others, have palm'd upon the World; as has been already shewn, *p.* 51. *A. D.* 398. Besides, the 13th and 16th Canons make it plainly appear, That this Council must be altogether, or at least in Part a Forgery; for the one says, *A Simple Monk upon Occasion may baptize, and so may a Deacon.* By the Words *Simple Monk*, I take for granted he means a *Layman*; which the 16th Canon seems to corroborate, which says, *Infants not as yet baptiz'd, ought to be baptiz'd, if it should happen in a Place where no Priest is to be had.*

But if the Father, or any other Perſon, provided he be a Chriſtian, ſhould baptize, he doth not commit a Sin. This Canon, I think, fairly explains the former. The Menage of which calls the whole Council in Queſtion; for the Doctrine of theſe Canons was not in Practice in this Age, no more than it was 500 Years before: And therefore I can look upon it no more than a Forgery, to maintain and ſupport, by daubing upon it a little Colour of Antiquity, the modern Practice of the Church of *Rome* in worſhiping Images, and allowing Laymen to baptize.

The ſame Year another Council was called at *Conſtantinople*, (which is term'd the Fourth of this Century) but upon a very different Occaſion; and without a Sham Synodical Epiſtle to countenance it. It was called under the Emperor *Leo*, who had baniſh'd *Nicephorus*, and *Theodotus* was put in his Room; yet, tho' it was againſt *Image-Worſhip*, and called by the Emperor *Leo*, *Labbé* will put the Pope's Name into the Title. The Biſhops who were at this Synod, condemned *Image-Worſhip* and the Second *Nicene* Council. This Synod abounds in Authorities as much as the former comes ſhort; for moſt *Greek* Hiſtorians take Notice of this, particularly *Theodore* in his Epiſtle to this Synod, who being a Favourer of *Images*, excuſes himſelf and others for not being preſent at it, defending the Cauſe of *Images* in the ſame Epiſtle.

Till the Year 816 its plain, that *Regulars* were ſubject to the Juriſdiction of the Biſhop in whoſe Diſtrict they liv'd, who were the proper Viſitors of Abbots, and the Societies ſubjected to their Care. For in the Firſt Year of *Lewis the Holy*, a Council was called at *Aix la Chapelle* in *Germany*, where a Hundred ſeventy and three Capitulars or Canons were conſtituted for the Diſcipline of Clergymen

and

and Monks; the Hundred thirty fourth of which leaves the final Judgment and Diſpoſition of refractory and incorrigible Monks to the Diſcretion and Power of the Biſhop. Indeed, the Biſhop is not named, and therefore the Friends of the *Pontificate* may, perhaps, according to their common Way of *Subterfuging*, claim this Power to be inveſted in their Biſhop of *Rome*; but Pope *Stephanus*, at that Time Biſhop of *Rome*, had nothing to do in this Council, as I can find among the Editors; and therefore it muſt be meant only of the Biſhop of the Dioceſs to whom the Monaſtery was ſubject.

About this Time *Chrodegange* Biſhop of *Metz* publiſh'd Thirty four Capitulars or Canons, ſetting forth good and wholſom Diſcipline both for *Seculars* and *Regulars*, and which the Editors admit as authentick, ſeveral of which contradict the preſent Practice of the Church of *Rome*; particularly the Twentieth, which, ſpeaking of the Diſcipline that ought to be obſerv'd in *Lent*, expreſly forbids *Abſtinence on Sundays*. *Labb. T.* 7. *p.* 1453. Which Canon paſſing without any Annotation, the Editor ſeems to forget himſelf, or, after ſo many Contradictions, to be aſham'd of the Blunders he had made before. Otherwiſe, they might as well have thrown out this Canon, forbidding the *Sunday*'s *Faſt*, as they have done that of the *Saturday*'s *Faſt*, which the 65th *Apoſtolick Canon* forbids. This, they ſay, *No Father mentions. Labb. T.* 1. *p.* 60. *Bin. p.* 17. *col.* 2. Though, as they often do, they contradict themſelves; for they own, that *Ignatius*, *Clemens Romanus*, the Canons of the *Sixth General Council*, *Gregory Nyſſen*, *Anaſtaſius Nicenus*, and *Tertul. de jejun. adv. Pſycl. c.* 14 & 15. do all ſpeak of *Saturday* as a Day on which Faſting was forbid. Beſides, the Reaſon of forbearing Abſtinence on *Sundays*, is plainly proved

proved from the Canons of the Apoſtolick Ages, and many ſubſequent Centuries, by commanding all to *pray ſtanding*, in regard to the Reſurrection of our Bleſſed Saviour, which was on that Day. But theſe Things not anſwering the preſent *Innovations* of the modern Church of *Rome*, they muſt be laid aſide, tho' juſtifiable by the moſt ancient Canons and Practice of the Apoſtolick and Primitive Fathers and Times.

Lewis the Holy, in the Third Year of his Reign, ſet forth Nine and twenty *Capitulars* relating to Diſcipline, the Sixteenth of which, by the Inhibition expreſs'd in it, forbids the Biſhops of *Italy (alias Lombardy)* for the Time to come, to exact Oaths or Gifts from thoſe whom they ordain'd, contrary to Divine and Canonical Authority; the Puniſhment of which Offence was *Degradation*. Now theſe *Capitulars* coming out in the 3d Year of *Lewis the Holy*, it muſt be about the 19th of *Leo* III.'s Pontificate. How ſtrange is it then, that ſuch grievous Crimes, no leſs than *Simony*, ſhould be acted even in the Pope's View, and he take no Notice of them? This plainly implies, that he muſt either be very looſe in Point of Diſcipline, or that he had no Power. And truly I am apt to believe both: For if he had been regular, or able to ſuppreſs Irregularities, I do not ſee any Occaſion for the Emperor's troubling himſelf in theſe Matters. But it is plain from the Canon it ſelf, that *Leo* III. had no Power; for he is neither conſulted nor named in this Affair. Beſides, if we look back into Pope *Leo*'s Life, the Editors would make us believe he was one of the moſt active Biſhops that ſate at *Rome*.

[817.] Pope *Paſchal* this Year aſcends the Pontifical Chair, a ſtrenuous Aſſerter of *Image-Worſhip*; which appears by his complimenting *Theodore*, and re-

refuſing Entrance in *Rome* to the *Commiſſaries* of *Theodote* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*. In the Second Year of his Pontificate, to ſhew his further Zeal, he erects a Monaſtery for the *Greek Refugee-Image-Worſhipers*, in or near the Church of St. *Praxes* in *Rome*, and plentifully endowed it. His Life is made up by the Editors of a great many Benefactions to pious Uſes. *Labb. T.* 7. *p.* 1491, *&c.* But notwithſtanding all their Flouriſhes in Praiſe of him, *Guag. Æmil.* in the Life of the Emperor *Lewis*, makes him guilty of a very falſe Step in Relation to his *Supremacy* and *Infallibility*; for he very ſubmiſſively begs Pardon of the Emperor for accepting the *Pontificate* without his Conſent. There are ſeveral Fables in this Pope's Life fit only to amuſe Children and Fools with, ſuch as finding the Bodies of *Cecilia* and other Saints diſcover'd to him in a Viſion, the miraculous extinguiſhing a great Fire, which burnt the *Engliſh College*, by his meer Preſence. And tho' *Binius*, in his Notes upon this Pope's Life, moſt magnificently applauds his Conduct in other Things, particularly for his ſtrenuous Defence of *Image-Worſhip*, yet he drops him very unhandſomly at laſt, by bringing his good Name in Queſtion, *Labb. &c. T.* 7. *p.* 1501, 1502. *For* ſays he, *at the Coronation of* Lotharius *the Son of* Lewis, *there happen'd a great Tumult, in which two Chief Men of the Church of* Rome *were ſlain, and for which Pope* Paſchal *was very much ſuſpected by* Lotharius. *From which Calumny he was forced to purge himſelf by an Oath.* And then going on with the foreſaid Story of his extinguiſhing the Fire by his Preſence, he adds, *Which, Things, if they were true, it's likely he did to take off the Suſpicion of Murder, tho' the Author of the Life of* Lewis *contradicts it in plain Words.* But let us examine theſe Paſſages a little. As to the Murder, of which Pope *Paſchal* is ſuſpected by the Emperor *Lotharius*, and

his

his purging himſelf by an Oath, they plainly imply a *Legal Trial*, which are *Binius*'s Words, *Præſtito Juramento legitimè ſe purgavit. Ibid.* Then this Trial muſt imply a ſuperior Power in ſome Perſon or Perſons elſe, who muſt judge him, or at leaſt call him in Queſtion, and oblige him to clear himſelf. From whence it is plain he had a Superior; and, tho' an *Infallible Judge*, was forced to clear himſelf according to Form.

The two Epiſtles which are father'd on this Pope, ſmell very ſtrong of the Forge. The Firſt is to *Petronacius* Archbiſhop of *Ravenna*, and is made up of nothing but broken and imperfect Sentences. Which, how corrupt ſoever it be, as *Labbé* in the Margin owns, *T.* 7. *p.* 1502. ſerves to ſhew, that the Church of *Ravenna* owns the Confirmation of all her Privileges to the Biſhop of *Rome*; and therefore ſhall not be left out, come from whence it will.

The Second Epiſtle is intended only as a Confirmation of the finding the Body of St. *Cecilia* and other Relicks. This is ſo infamous and extravagant an Impoſture, that none but the blindeſt Bigot can admit. The Author of this Pope's Life tells us, *Labb. T.* 7. 1494. That the Virgin *Cecilia* appeared to *Paſchal* in a Viſion, directing him to the Place where ſhe was buried; where he found her Body wrap'd up in thoſe rich Veſtments in which ſhe ſuffer'd Martyrdom, and to that very Time moiſt with her Blood. He likewiſe there found the Body of her betrothed Husband *Valerian* and others; with Abundance of ſuch like Stuff. As barefac'd a Piece of Forgery as this is, *Binius* gives it his Sanction, quoting the *Vatican* for his Authority; from whence, he tells you, *Baronius* recites the Story. *An.* 821. *n.* 2 *&* 3. from whom he takes it. But leſt that Authority ſhould not be

ſuf-

ſufficient, according to Cuſtom, an Epiſtle muſt give it better, which they expect all ſhall pay Obedience to. The whole Compoſition of this Epiſtle ſhews it one continued Impoſture; for, in the firſt Place, it is written to no Body, the Title running plainly thus: *Epiſtle* II. *of Pope* Paſchal I. *about the finding of the Relicks of St.* Cecilia. And beſides, the Body of the Epiſtle is no more than a bare Tranſcript from the Life of this Pope; and is foiſted in here for no other End, than to confirm the Uſe of theſe and other trifling Relicks.

In the Appendix, *Labb. T.* 7. *p.* 1869. there is an Epiſtle of Pope *Paſchal* to *Barnard* Archbiſhop of *Vienna*, which the Editors pretend they took from the *Florentine* Library. And it may be ſo. Nor do I believe they care from whence they take any Thing that will but ſerve a Turn. But this Epiſtle has two or three Marks which render it very ſuſpicious. Firſt, he ſeems to intimate to *Barnard*, *That he did but know that he had taken upon him the Government of the Church of* Vienna. By which it appears, his Supremacy had nothing to do in the Buſineſs of making *Barnard* Archbiſhop there. Then, the Uſe of the *Pall*, which he recommends to *Barnard*. From whence, if this Epiſtle were genuine, we may juſtly infer, that Archbiſhop *Barnard* had received no Pall from *Rome*, and that the Church of *Vienna* was ignorant of the Uſe of it. The Date of this Epiſtle comes barely within Time, and from the Epiſtle of Pope *Eugene* II. to this ſame Archbiſhop *Barnard*, which bears the ſame Date, it is moſt certain one, if not both, muſt be a Forgery; which we will further examine in the Epiſtles of that Pope.

[824.] The Editors, in the Life of *Eugene* II. give him a general Character. But *Binius*, who loves to be Doing, though it be but Miſchief, and

that

that to his own Cauſe too, in his Notes on this Pope's Life, tells us, *Labb. T.* 7. *p.* 1541. That *Eugene* II. was created Pope in ſuch a Schiſm, that the Emperor *Lewis* was forced to ſend his Son *Lotharius* into the City, who there publiſh'd an Edict or Order, *Forbidding any to meddle in the Election of a Pope, but thoſe* Romans *who of old Time had the Power of Chooſing.* And tho' by the ſubſequent Part of this Edict, which commands *the Tranſgreſſors of it to appear before the Emperor to anſwer for their Neglect of it.* Yet, to give ſome Countenance to the Temporality of the Biſhop of *Rome*, which by this ſeems quite eclips'd, *Binius* ſays, This Edict was made by the Conſent of the Pope. Certainly if the Pope could have made an Edict of this Kind of any Force, the Emperor would not have been at the Trouble of ſending his Son to quiet a Tumult, and regulate the diſorderly Election of the Biſhop of *Rome*, which the Pope himſelf might have done, had he been ſo powerful then as the Editors would fain repreſent him.

Part of the *Diploma* which the Editors father upon this Pope, is by *Labb. in Marg. T.* 7. *p.* 1542. ſaid to be in *Hundius, in Metrop. in Utolpho Archiepiſcopo Laureacenſi*: So that, as in the Caſe of the two Epiſtles to *Barnard* Archbiſhop of *Vienna*, one or both muſt be a Forgery. But that which makes this look more ſuſpicious is, there are Eleven Decrees which are tack'd to this *Diploma*, ſome of which are Decrees of Pope *Eugene* III. who was not made Pope till the Year 1145.

The Epiſtle of Pope *Eugene* II. to *Barnard* Archbiſhop of *Vienna*, appears a Sham from ſeveral Marks. The Style is ridiculous, beginning with *Congaudeo valde*, and ſuch like; the Argument without Meaning, or at beſt obſcure and unintelligible:

ble; only, I ſuppoſe, for which it was forged, in the Tail of it, there appears ſomething like a Prerogative peculiar to the Biſhop of *Rome*. But that which quite deſtroys the Reputation of this Epiſtle, and makes it appear a direct Forgery, is the falſe Date. For this Epiſtle is dated the 8th of *July*, in the 4th Year of the Emperor *Lewis*, which was the firſt Year of Pope *Paſchal*; for it is moſt certain from all Hands, particularly *Cabbaſutius*, who gleans from *Baronius* and others, in his Table of the Popes, that Pope *Eugene* II. did not take Poſſeſſion of the Pontifical Chair till the Year 824, whereas the 4th Year of the Emperor *Lewis the Holy* was the Year of our Lord 817. So that, according to this Chronology, *Eugene* muſt aſſume the Name of Pope, and write this Epiſtle, Seven Years before he was Pope. But theſe are ſmall and trivial Blunders with the *Infallible Judge*, according to the Editors. Truly, if I were of their Intereſt, I would adviſe them to defend their Topicks by injoining an implicite Faith on the People, and not pretend to prove and maintain them by ſuch very wretched Authorities, which muſt eternally faſten on them a moſt poor and deſpicable Opinion among the Learned and Ingenuous.

[827.] Pope *Valentine* ſat but 40 Days; and yet there is as large an Encomium beſtow'd upon him, as if he had held the Pontificate ſo many Years. To him ſucceeds *Gregory* IV. a Prelate of extraordinary Piety and Goodneſs, and whoſe Character would appear more illuſtrious without that fulſome nauſeous Flattery which *Anaſtaſius* beſtows on it. In which *Binius* (who rather than be idle will do Miſchief) muſt have a Hand too. There are two Epiſtles of this Pope's extant. *Labb. T.* 7. *p.* 1571. The firſt of which by the Editors is directed to *all Biſhops in General, in the Caſe of* Aldri-

cus *Biſhop of* Cenoma, *that he ſhould be accus'd no where but at* Rome, *ſetting forth the Power of the Papal See.* According to this Title, and the Tenure of the Epiſtle, any one might imagine, that this Pope claim'd an *Univerſal Power*, and that all Appeals ought to be made only to *Rome.* But the true Title runs thus: *To all our moſt Beloved Brethren and Fellow-Biſhops in* France, Germany, *and* Europe; by which he does not ſeem to claim any Obedience but from theſe Biſhops in thoſe Countries which were within his Patriarchate; no Mention being made of the Eaſtern Churches, which at that Time were ſubject to their own Patriarch.

And here it is worthy Obſervation, That during the Reign of the Emperor *Lewis the Holy*, there were many Councils call'd by his immediate Command, the Pope being not ſo much as mention'd in any of them, except by the Editors in the Title of ſome of them, though no otherwiſe, than that his Name is inſerted in the Title, and, to gloſs the Matter, is put before the Emperor's; though, as is ſaid before, he is neither mention'd nor conſulted with in the Canons of them which relate to Eccleſiaſtick Diſcipline, and the mutual Duty of Kings and Subjects. One of theſe was

The Council of *Paris*, (which is the Second of this Century, and by the Editors reckon'd the Sixth) call'd immediately by the Emperor *Lewis the Holy*, and the Metropolitans of *Germany*, *Belgium*, *&c.* were appointed by the Emperor himſelf, as *Sirmondus* in his Notes owns, *Labb. T. 7. p.* 1667. and the general Epiſtle of the Emperor confirms, *ibid, p.* 1590. by which this Council was ſummon'd. Many excellent Chapters or Canons were conſtituted by the Biſhops in this Synod, which are very plain and poſitive, confirm'd by many Texts of Scripture, and Quotations of the Fathers, and ſe-

veral of the Orthodox Biſhops of *Rome*; and therefore the Editors paſs them without any Note or Animadverſion, which may not a little be wonder'd at, conſidering that the Tenth Canon ſtrikes at the very Root of their Doctrine of *Purgatory*, which expreſly forbids any to believe ſuch Doctrine. The Words are theſe: *It has been ſaid by ſome Chriſtians, that they who are born again in Chriſt, though they live and die in Sin, ſhall not be puniſh'd with eternal Fire, but for a Time in* Purgatory. *And whereas many affirm, but cannot prove this from Holy Scripture, let them take Heed that they not only not believe this, but not ſo much as mention it with their Lips, leſt thereby they delude themſelves and others with a vain Security.* Labb. T. 7. p. 1649. Whether the Text is too poſitive, or whether *Binius* grew more modeſt, I will not ſay; but, as has been before obſerv'd, *Binius* and others did not uſe to ſtick at a Comment upon ſuch an Occaſion, and produce even a Contradiction for an Argument in Defence of any darling modern Topick. But though they had ſaid ever ſo much in this Caſe, the Words of the Canon are ſo plain, that they can admit of no Subterfuge; and it is moſt evident, that the Emperor and the Fathers of this Council were of a quite different Opinion to the modern Romaniſts in this Point of Purgatory. *

To this Time, which was in the Year 829, all Abbots, Abbeſſes, and Regulars, were ſubject to the Viſitation and Juriſdiction of the Biſhop of the Dioceſe in which they liv'd, as appears by the 18th Canon of this Council; though now, like lawleſs Exempts, they rather Lord it over, than obey their Dioceſan. *Lab. T. 7. p. 1664.*

---

* Note, *Compare this Canon with the Predeſtinarians of theſe Times.*

[844.] To this Time likewiſe the Papacy was a very precarious and uncertain Thing; for tho' *Sergius* II. was a noble *Roman*, and Arch-Presbyter of the Church of *Rome*, yet upon his Entrance on the Pontificate, *Lewis* was ſent by his Father *Lotharius* the Emperor, in all Haſte, to charge the *Romans* not to proceed to the Election of a Pope till the Emperor had approv'd of the Perſon they intended to elect. Soon after came the Emperor himſelf; at which Time Pope *Sergius* ſooths all by anointing *Lewis*, *Lotharius*'s Son, King of the *Lombards*. *Labb. T.* 7. *p.* 1797. From whence any Man may ſafely conclude, that the Biſhops of *Rome* had not as yet taken upon them that exorbitant Power in Temporals, nor aſſumed that Superiority in the Catholick Church which they now claim.

[847.] Pope *Leo* IV.'s Life is uſher'd in by *Anaſtaſius* with a long and numerous Train of Encomiums, which I ſhall not go about to contradict; for where there is any Colour of Truth, I think we ought to believe the beſt of all Men; and rether tranſmit the Virtues than the Vices of the Deceas'd to Poſterity. This Pope, it ſeems, with much Reluctancy is promoted to the Pontifical See; but, ſays *Anaſtaſius*, *Labb. T.* 8. *p.* 3. notwithſtanding the unanimous Conſent of the People of *Rome* in his Election, without the Imperial Licence they dare not conſecrate him. This ſtill takes off from the Supremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*; who, it ſeems by this Inſtance, had not as yet acquir'd that Latitude of Power which his Succeſſors have ſince aſſum'd. The Two Miracles ſaid to be perform'd by him, and introduced with their uſual ridiculous Formality, are enough to perſuade Men, that the whole Account of this Pope is fabulous, and do very much leſſen his real good Acts. The Prayers of good Men are undoubtedly very prevalent

lent with God; but that the Preſence of this Pope, though attended with the whole Catalogue of Croſſes and Relicks, ſhould put to Flight a Baſilisk, that had deſtroyed great Numbers of People; or that by his ſingle Appearance the Fire ſhould ſpare St. *Peter*'s Church more than it had done other Churches or Palaces, is what I cannot ſo readily credit. Theſe Fables diminiſh the Characters of the beſt of their Popes, in the Opinion of all prudent Men, who would appear more holy to the World without them. *Binius* muſt give his Hand to theſe Miracles, which he confirms without Scruple, ſwallowing others of the ſame Authority. But when he comes to animadvert upon the aforeſaid Paſſage of the Emperor's confirming the Election of the Biſhops of *Rome*, he cannot forbear ſhewing himſelf a very partial and unfair Commentator. *Ibid. p.* 29. *Pope* Leo (ſays he) *null'd the Right of Confirming the Elected Popes, which had either, through Fear, been given by the People of* Rome *to the Emperors, or by them foully uſurp'd.* In lieu of which, Pope *Leo* obliges himſelf to pay Obedience to the Imperial Laws. Hitherto then it is plain the Biſhops of *Rome* had aſſumed no Sovereignty in Temporals: Nor by the Words quoted by *Binius* does it appear that he had null'd *the Right of Confirming the Election of the Biſhops of* Rome; for they ſay no otherwiſe than thus: *It is agreed between us and you, That the Election and Conſecration of the Biſhop for the Time to come, be lawfully and canonically perform'd.* From which Words, *Binius* will not find it an eaſy Thing to infer, That becauſe the Election and Conſecration of the Biſhop ought to be done canonically, that therefore the Emperors had quitted their Right of confirming the Elections. And whatever *Binius*, or any of the Editors, may ſay in this Point, it is plain from the Fragment of

an Epiſtle from this Pope to the Emperor *Lotharius*, That *Leo* IV. aſſumed no ſuch Power as *Binius* would palm upon him: For in that Epiſtle *Leo* excuſes himſelf for not conferring the Pall, *&c.* on *Alteus* Biſhop of *Autun* in *Burgundy*; beginning thus: *Mandaſtis, &c. You commanded, That the Privilege and Pall ſhould be conferr'd on* Alteus, *but we beg your Majeſty not to be affronted,* &c. *Labb. T.* 8. *p.* 32, 33.

[855.] That the Emperors ſtill kept up the Right of confirming Elections of the Popes, is plain likewiſe from the Life of Pope *Benedict* III. In Oppoſition to whom, the Emperor *Lewis* ſet up *Anaſtaſius* the Prieſt-Cardinal, who in the laſt Pope's Time was depos'd for Non-Reſidence in his Pariſh. This Fewd ran ſo high, that poor *Benedict* was ſtripp'd of his Pontifical Habits, ſcourg'd, and thrown into Priſon: Nor could he find any Redreſs till the Emperor's Ambaſſadors conſented to this Election. *Lab. T.* 8. *p.* 227. There is one Thing in this Pope's Life, in the Page now mention'd, which puts me in mind of ſomething like it in the laſt Pope's Life by the ſame Hand, *viz. Anaſtaſius*; and that is this: After *Leo*, with much Importunity, was choſen Biſhop of *Rome*, we are told, that they, obſerving the ancient Cuſtom, kiſſed his Feet. How ancient this Cuſtom was I do not remember, or that to this Time it is any where recogniz'd by any of the Editors: However here it is recorded to have taken Place; which I cannot think is for any other End mention'd under the Name of an old Cuſtom, but to countenance the ſubſequent Practice of it in the Biſhops and Clergy of the Church of *Rome*. *Lab. T.* 8. *p.* 2. For in the Life of Pope *Benedict* III. the ſame Cuſtom is obſerv'd; where they tell us, That thoſe who had been his greateſt Enemies before came

and

and kiſs'd his Feet, and acknowledged their former Offence. *Lab. T.* 8. *p.* 227. But a little further they tell us, that the Emperor's Ambaſſadors, who had moſt ſtrenuouſly before oppos'd his Election, were reconcil'd, and talk'd more kindly with him than before; but not one Word of their kiſſing his Feet.

I ſhall here take Notice of one Inſtance, (tho' I could of many) and ſo take my Leave of that ridiculous Cuſtom of the Editors, in thruſting the Pope's Name into the Titles of the Councils, tho' they knew nothing of the Matter; which cannot more plainly appear than in the Second Council of *Soiſſons* in *France*, *A. D.* 853. The Title of this Council does but lamely own the Pope, telling us, it was held 10 Kal. of *May*, *A. D.* 853. which was in the Sixth Year of *Leo* IV. and the Thirteenth of *Charles the Bald*. Now for any Service this does them, they might as well have left the Pope's Name out, for he is neither named in the Canons, nor in the Acts of this Council; nor among the Thirty Biſhops and more, beſides Abbots, *&c.* is there one to be found who ſubſcrib'd to this Council in the Pope's Name, which never was omitted in any Council where the Biſhop of *Rome* had his Legates. Moreover, the Firſt Canon of this Council makes it plainly appear, that the Pope had nothing to do in this Council; for it poſitively ſays, That *Hincmar* Biſhop of *Rhemes*, *Vanilo* Biſhop of *Sens*, and *Almaric* Biſhop of *Turenne*, all of them Metropolitans, preſided in this Council in their own proper Perſons, and as Metropolitans of the Places they repreſented, not as Subſtitutes, by a delegated Authority from another; which, if it had been ſo, would have been accordingly expreſs'd. But *Labbé*, *T.* 8. *p.* 80. in the Preface to the Canons of this Council, very fairly and ho-

neſtly tells the Truth, owning the Authority that call'd it. *The moſt Glorious* Charles, *Son of the moſt Religious Prince* Lewis, *conſented to the Biſhops, then deſirous to hold a Council, and commanded them to meet at* Soiſſons, *in the Monaſtery of St.* Medard *and St.* Sebaſtian, *on the* 10 *Kal. of* May : *Where the King himſelf, laying aſide all Secular Affairs, vouchſaf'd to be preſent, that he might not only by his Love to Religion ſhew himſelf to be a Son of the Church, but upon Occaſion protect them with his Power.* Here it is plain by whoſe Authority this Council was call'd: Nor is the Pope ſo much as mention'd in this Preface, though they thruſt him into the Title. The Occaſion of this Council was very remarkable ; and if Pope *Leo* had been minded to concern himſelf in it, he could not have wiſh'd for a more glorious Opportunity of ſhewing himſelf in the Intereſt of the Church and State : For *Ebbo* was depoſed for Treaſon againſt the Emperor *Lewis* in the Second Council of *Thionville* ; but *Lewis* dying, and *Lotharius* ſucceeding, he obtain'd an Edict, whereby he was reſtor'd ; upon which he ordain'd ſeveral Clergymen : Which *Hincmar*, when he came to the See of *Rhemes*, would not allow ; for *Ebbo* was lawfully and canonically depos'd, and not canonically reſtor'd ; wherefore his Acts could be reckon'd no more than the Acts of an Uſurper, and were invalid. Now it is moſt certain, if the Pope had been any Way concern'd or conſulted in this Buſineſs, by himſelf or his Legates, it is highly improbable, that the Editors would have left him out, who take all Occaſions to mention his Name. Nor would *Sirmondus* in his additional Notes on this Council have neglected it. *Labb. T.* 8. *p.* 1943. *in App.*

To this Time likewiſe (as has before been obſerv'd) the Biſhop of *Rome* either totally neglected,

or

or at leaſt did not claim any Power over the Monaſteries and Religious Houſes of *Gaul*: But it rather ſeems, the Court of *Rome* had not as yet pretended to any ſuch Supremacy; for it is plain from the Twelve Capitulars of *Charles the Bald*, King of *France*, which are annexed to the Second Council of *Soiſſons*, that all Religious Houſes were under the Juriſdiction of the Biſhop of the Dioceſe; and though they were liable to a Royal Viſitation, in caſe of Dilapidation, Irregularity, Alienation, or otherwiſe, yet the King's Commiſſioners, ſent on Purpoſe to enquire into Abuſes, and ſtrengthen'd with the Royal Authority, could not act without the *Council and Conſent of the Biſhop* of that Diſtrict they for the Time viſited; which is expreſs'd in thoſe very Capitulars, *Labb. T.* 8. *p.* 93, 94. So that to the Year 853, the Regulars of the Latin Church were not poiſon'd with thoſe rebellious Principles they now profeſs, but liv'd in due Obedience to their Biſhop, who had Power to reſtrain them according to their Demerit, without any Delegation of Power from the See of *Rome*. And though King *Charles* did interpoſe here, yet it was, as is ſaid before in the Preface to the Second Council of *Soiſſons*, to protect the Church with his Power; for in caſe of ſome Abuſes, where a Biſhop may lawfully, but cannot correct, the Aſſiſtance of the Prince is not only ſeaſonable, but highly neceſſary. And, to the immortal Glory of this pious Prince, it muſt be ſaid of him, that he was a *Nurſing Father* to the Church, all his Edicts tending to her Service and Honour; not only enquiring into the Abuſes committed in his own Reign, but into the Alienations of the Church's Patrimony in his Predeceſſors Time; as is expreſly mention'd in the Second Capitular, *ibid.* where, in Conjunction with the Biſhop of the Dioceſe, and other his faithful Subjects,

Subjects, he desires that they may consider what and how they ought to act in Obedience to *God's Will and their own Salvation*: A Consideration worthy so pious a King, and to be imitated by all succeeding Christian Princes. But in the Case of Canonical Obedience, which the inferior Clergy ow'd to their proper Bishop, especially Presbyters, the Fourth Capitular is very positive, referring wholly to the Disposition and Discretion of the Bishop of the Diocese wherein they live, not the least Mention being made either of the Regale or Pontificate. And as if this pious Prince, and those holy Fathers in this Council, foresaw the unbridled Wildness and Disobedience of the modern Regulars to their Diocesans, there is a most express and peculiar Provision made in the Sixth Capitular to restrain them from injuring the Church in her Tythes, obliging the Missionaries, in Conjunction still with the Bishop of the Place, and Chiefs of the Monasteries, to inspect into the Estates of Monasteries, that they pay Tythes; and that if any Dispute should arise, they should all appear before the King, in whose Presence the whole Affair was to be determin'd.

What I have a little before said of the Seasonableness, and sometimes Necessity of the Church's calling in the Royal Aid to assist her, is in the Tenth Capitular more particularly express'd, and which is another remarkable Instance of the tender Love and Duty of this Prince to the Church: For there it is said, *That the Magistrates shall assist the Bishops in their Visitation; and whom the Bishop by Excommunication cannot compel, they by the Royal Authority and Power shall force to Penitence and Satisfaction.* Lab. T. 8. p. 94. And the Eleventh Capitular goes further with the same; declaring, That tho' the Bishops or Chiefs of Monasteries should be unreason-

reaſonable in their Demands, yet he will lay no Royal Command upon Eccleſiaſtick Benefices; which plainly ſhews he was a *Nurſing Father* to indulge and cheriſh, and not imperiouſly domineer in or over the Church.

But to keep the Regulars ſtill in Subjection to their Superiors, the ſame Year, *viz.* 853, in the Pontificate of *Leo* IV. that excellent Prelate, with the reſt of the holy Fathers aſſembled in the Second *Roman* Council of this Century, ſtrictly forbad Abbots, or any others, except thoſe who can confer the Order of Prieſthood, and take canonical Cognizance of offending Presbyters, to collate to Churches. *Lab. T.* 8. *p.* 119. And, to preſerve the Rights and Patrimony of the Church from any Incroachment, by Way of Supplement to this Council, the ſame Pope *Leo* ſubjoins, That all Biſhops throughout their Diſtricts, by themſelves and Presbyters, charge their People duly to pay their Firſt-Fruits and Tythes, under Pain of Excommunication: At which Time all Monaſteries were liable to the Inquiſition and Viſitation of the Biſhop of the Dioceſe.

It is moſt certain nothing is ſo illuſtrious as Truth, or can render the Character of a good Man more bright: And therefore all ingenuous Men will allow I have done more Honour to the Memory of this holy Father, Pope *Leo* IV. by telling no more than the Truth of him, than all the Editors have by their fulſome and fabulous Encomiums.

[858.] It is worth obſerving, That all or moſt of the Popes were choſen with much Reluctancy, according to *Anaſtaſius*: And though many of them have been known to wade through Blood and Bribery to this deſirable Poſt in the Church, yet they ſeemingly ſubmitted to a Sort of Holy Rape from

from the People upon their Elections. Of this Number is *Nicholas* I. whoſe Advancement to the Ponficate I ſhall not charge with either of the aforeſaid Crimes; only by the way obſerve, That he was conſecrated in the Preſence of *Cæſar. Lab. T.* 8. *p.* 251. for what Reaſon I cannot imagine, except that before hinted, of the Emperor's confirming the Election; which hitherto, notwithſtanding what they talk of *Leo* IV. the Emperors had not parted with.

The Life of this Pope entertains us with Variety of Stories: Among which, none are ſo remarkable as that about *Lotharius*'s divorcing his Wife *Theutberg*, and excommunicating *Theutgand* and *Gunthar*, Archbiſhops of *Treves* and *Colen*, who in the Third Synod of *Metz* were forward Inſtruments in the Confirmation of the Divorce of *Theutberg* from *Lotharius*, and of his marrying *Waldfrad*. In which Tranſaction it is to be obſerved, That the Pope's Legates in this Council were the great Promoters and Inſtigators of what was there done; for which *Radoaldus* was afterwards deprived and excommunicated.

The Fifth Council of *Rome* in this Century, which was held *A. D.* 863. by *Nicholas* I. firſt nulls the Acts of the Third Council of *Metz*, and then depoſes *Gunthar* and *Theutgand*, the Two Ringleaders and Aſſerters of *Lotharius*'s Divorce. The Decrees of this Council being publiſh'd, the Legates of the Council of *Metz* make as ſharp a Reply, for deſpiſing the Sentence of the Pope, they charge him with Ambition, who being an Apoſtle among Apoſtles, aſſum'd to himſelf the Empire of the World: With Partiality and Injuſtice, for not correcting what he found amiſs in the Acts which they ſent to him, and returning them again, whereby they might have been better inform'd, and concurr'd

curr'd with the Opinion of their Fellow Biſhops: With Treachery, for that they being called in to his Preſence, and ſuſpecting no Ill, ordering the Doors to be lock'd on them, by a Conſpiracy of Part Clergy, Part Laymen, in a moſt Uncanonical and irregular Manner, without Accuſer, Witneſs or Liberty of Defence, he moſt arbitrarily and tirannically had condemned them, all other Metropolitans and Dioceſans at that Time being abſent; with Abundance more to the ſame Purpoſe. *Lab. T.* 8. *p.* 770, 771, 772, *&c.* This is a heavy Charge, and, if true, makes Pope *Nicolas* look very black; but the Editors make light of it, for they never trouble themſelves with any other Anſwer than this, (and that only in the Margin of *Lab. ibid.*) *viz. Theſe are Reproaches common to all Hereticks againſt the Pope.*

I ſhould have obſerv'd to the Reader, That in the Front of this Fifth *Roman* Council, there is a Preface by Way of Epiſtle by Pope *Nicolas*, which in the Running Title is thus; *Pope* Nicolas *to all Biſhops*; which, in the Head of a Council, may ſeem to carry an Air of Supremacy with it; tho' the ſubſequent Title is quite different, for that ſays thus: Nicolas, *Biſhop and Servant of the Servants of God, to the moſt Reverend and Holy our Brethren the Archbiſhops and Biſhops of* France, Italy, *and* Germany.

But to return to the Charge of *Gunter* and *Theutgand*, which the Editors no other Way excuſe than as is ſaid in the Margin, very much of it is confirm'd by the ſubſequent Actions of this Pope's Life. The Year after his Advancement to the Papacy, he is called upon for Aſſiſtance by *Photius* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, whither he ſends two Legates the Year following to inquire into the Cauſe: But he ſoon diſcover'd to which Party he was inclined, for in the Year 861, he meerly prevaricated with *Photius*,

tius, and the Council called by him, and openly ſided with *Ignatius* the depoſed Patriarch; to which Sentence tho' his Legates had given their Conſent, yet he denied his, darting moſt bitter Reproaches and Calumnies againſt *Photius*, and afterwards upon their Return excommunicated both his Legates. But that which inflam'd this Pique of the Pope againſt *Photius*, was his Attempt to regain King *Michael* and the *Bulgarians*, who were lately come over to the Chriſtian Faith, and were really Subjects to the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*. And therefore the Pope could have no Reaſon to take it ill from *Photius*, for the Irregularity lay on the Pope's Side in invading the Property of another's Patriarchate, which is expreſly forbid by many Canons of both *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern* Churches; and tho' he had ſent two Legates to confirm the *Bulgarians* in the Faith of Chriſt, (which was but a charitable Office, and might be expected from a Biſhop of the Chriſtian Church) yet he had no Right or Claim to their Canonical Obedience, which was due only to their proper Biſhop. But if we ſearch a little deeper into the Cauſe of this implacable Reſentment of Pope *Nicolas* againſt *Photius*, we ſhall find, that Image-Worſhip was the Cement, which had ſo ſtrictly engaged *Nicolas* and *Ignatius*. Of this we have a fair Proof from the 7th Epiſtle of this Pope to the Emperor *Michael*. *Lab. T.* 8. *p.* 288, 289. wherein, after he had acquainted him with the Sentence he had paſs'd on *Photius*, and obliged him to reſtore *Ignatius* to the See of *Conſtantinople*, and recal thoſe Biſhops whom *Photius* had baniſh'd, he addreſſes the Emperor thus in Behalf of Image-Worſhip: *Being obliged ſtrictly to obſerve the Decrees of our Holy Anceſtors, and the Opinions of the Fathers, we command that the Images of our Lord and his Virgin Mother, and of all the Saints, from juſt*

Abel,

Abel, (*according to the ancient Cuſtom of the Church*) *be preſerv'd inviolable and untouch'd*; *and that* John *Patriarch of* Conſtantinople, *who deſtroyed Images, with his Followers, be excommunicated.* Theſe and other Injunctions the Emperor *Michael* did not live to perform; for he was murder'd by *Baſilius Macedo*, who thereupon aſcends the Imperial Throne; for which Murder *Photius*, like a true primitive Father, bravely excommunicates him; and *Baſilius* in Revenge depoſes *Photius* and recalls *Ignatius*, with whom return'd Image-Worſhip, and to which *Photius* was a great Enemy. About Nine Years after, *Baſilius* bates of his Reſentment, and is reconcil'd to *Photius*, whom in a ſhort Time after, *Ignatius* dying, he reſtores to the See of *Conſtantinople*, *John* VIII. being then Pope, between whom and *Photius* there was an Orthodox Underſtanding: Of which more when we come to that Pontificate. I ſhall not inſiſt upon ſeveral of this Pope's extravagant Actions; ſuch as his burning *Photius*'s Book, his wheedling the Emperor *Michael* (a known Matricide) to depoſe *Photius*, which he could not obtain; his triumphing over depoſed *Photius*, tho' he had incurr'd the Emperor *Baſilius*'s Reſentment, and this Sentence, for no other Reaſon than excommunicating him for the Murder of *Michael* his Predeceſſor, *&c.* So great was their Malice againſt the Enemies of the Pontificate, or thoſe that would not go their Lengths in all Things, that they would patronize a Parricide, a Rebel, an Uſurper, or any Thing, rather than ſtand by or defend a pious Cauſe that interfer'd with their Supremacy. I will not pretend to give a Character of this holy and learned Patriarch *Photius*, which has already been done by ſeveral learned Pens. Let the Character of an Enemy ſuffice, and that is *Michael* the Monk, who acknowledges him *to be eminent for*

good

good Life and Literature. Baron. T. 10. *An.* 858. I am confident, that ſince St. *Peter*'s Time the Editors will be very much puzzled to find ſo excellent a Patriarch in the *Roman Kalendar.* But we ſhall ſay more of this Patriarch in the Pontificate of Pope *John* VIII.

The Editors, in the Story of *Hincmar* Archbiſhop of *Rhemes*, ſhew themſelves very partial and unfair, accuſing and condemning this good Man of Pride, Arrogance, Cruelty, and what not. But none ſo unhandſomly attack him as *Cabbaſutius*, *Notit. Eccleſ. p.* 351, 352, *&c.* where he tells us, That ſince the Time of the Apoſtles there never was ſuch an Inſtance of Hatred in one Catholick Biſhop towards another, as this of *Hincmar* Archbiſhop of *Rhemes*, againſt his Nephew *Hincmar* Biſhop of *Laon.* But the Story of *Rothard* being firſt, we'll begin with that. *Hincmar* of *Rhemes*, ſays *Cabbaſutius*, *ibid.* was a Man plentifully adorn'd with natural and acquir'd Wit, and in great Favour with *Charles* the *Bald*, which ſo puff'd him up, that, whenever he had Opportunity, he carried all before him. Agitated by this Kind of Spirit, he falls upon *Rothard* Biſhop of *Soiſſons*, who had depoſed a Prieſt for his diſſolute Life. Now it is very ſtrange and unlikely, that a Man of *Hincmar*'s Piety, Prudence, and Learning, ſhould proſecute a Biſhop for depoſing an irregular Prieſt, and ſuch an one, as *Cabbaſutius*, *p.* 301. ſays, was taken in the Fact of Adultery. Nor can it be ſuppoſed, that a Synod of Chriſtian Biſhops would join with their Metropolitan in ſo unjuſt and wicked a Sentence. But the aforeſaid Author ſays further, that King *Charles* commanded this Council to be called, *viz.* the Council of *Senlis*, *A. D.* 683. in which *Rothard* was condemn'd, and therefore calls it a Sham-Synod, *p.* 351. which he would ſcarce have done, or charg'd that Prince

with countenancing ſuch irregular Proceedings, had he been living. But be the Cauſe of this Sentence as black as *Dubbaſutius* makes it, and extorted from the Synod thro' Fear of the King, as he ſays, *ibid.* it is no more than what the Biſhop of *Rome* himſelf juſtified, if we may believe *Binius*, who in his Notes upon this Council of *Senlis* tells us, That *Hincmar* had obtain'd a Confirmation of the 3d Council of *Soiſſons*, (which had depoſed the ſaid *Rothard*) tho' ſurreptitiouſly. How a Matter of this Moment could be done ſurreptitiouſly, I cannot conceive. But, granting it to be done ſurreptitiouſly, it brings no ſmall Diſgrace upon the Infallibility of the Pope. To ſet this Affair right therefore, let us conſult *J. Sirmondus*. He tells the Truth of the Matter indeed, but ſeems to relate it from *Hincmar* himſelf, in theſe Words: Hincmar *tells us, That a Council of ſeveral Biſhops defended his Cauſe againſt* Rothard *in an Epiſtle to Pope* Nicolas, *which* Flodoard *mentions in* Lib. III. cap. 12. *I have long born with him,* (ſc. Rothard) *tho' not without great Concern for the Souls committed to his Care; and when I could bear no longer, I brought him before a Council of Biſhops, that he might hear them; whom he would not hear, but demanded Judgment againſt me. Lab. T. 8. p.* 761. And to make this Contempt of *Rothard's* more plain, *Labbé*, in the Third Council of *Soiſſons*, quotes the *Bertinian* Annals to the Year 861, in theſe Words: Hincmar *Archbiſhop of* Rhemes, *in a Provincial Synod, excommunicated* Rothard *Biſhop of* Soiſſons, *for his Diſobedience to Eccleſiaſtick Rules.* So that tho' his Crime is not truly known, yet he incurr'd the Sentence pronounc'd by the Synod for his Contempt. *Labb. T. 8. p.* 736. But to return to the Quotation of *J. Sirmondus* out of *Flodoardus*. This Quotation implies a Crime in *Rothard*, for which he had incurr'd the foreſaid Sentence. And

as to his Appealing to *Rome*, it is no more than what Pope *Nicolas* put into his Mouth; for in his 33d Epiſtle to *Rothard*, he adviſes him, if they will not let him go to *Rome*, not to fail to appeal to the Apoſtolick See. But the foreſaid Quotation ſhewing ſo much of a Crime as was implied in *Rothard*'s Contempt, the Editors endeavour to obviate it, by charging *Hincmar* with Ingratitude, Diſobedience, *&c.* in two Epiſtles ſubſequent to the Council of *Senlis*, and this Note of *Sirmondus* with the Quotation. Theſe two Epiſtles, *Labbé* ſaith, were ſent him from Cardinal *Barbarini*, by whoſe Command they were tranſcrib'd from the Papers of the famous *Lewis Holſten*. The Firſt of theſe Epiſtles is written in the Names of *Theutgand*, *Gunthar*, and *Arduicus*, to *Hincmar*, who ſeem to reproach him with Ingratitude to one *Hilduin*, formerly his Tutor and Governor. The Second is from the ſame, and two more to the Biſhops of *Belgic Gaul*, *&c.* concerning *Hincmar* and *Rothard*. I muſt confeſs, I cannot readily believe that theſe Epiſtles are genuine, for theſe Reaſons: Firſt, *Theutgand* and *Gunthar* were Primates, and in thoſe Times the Primates and Biſhops of thoſe Countries inſiſted on their own Rights, and would not acknowledge that Exorbitancy of Power which the Biſhop of *Rome* ſometimes claim'd. Beſides, the Council of *Antioch*, whoſe Canons the Second Epiſtle quotes, are directly againſt the Subject Matter of the Epiſtle, which all along blames *Hincmar* for Obſtinacy and the Scandal that this Treatment of *Rothard* had brought upon the Church. But theſe Canons, which they quote from this Council, make no Way for them; the Sixth Canon, in the Caſe of any one excommunicated by a Biſhop, will not allow any Appeal beyond a Synod: And for any Reſort to the Emperor, the Eleventh and Twelfth Ca-

Canons positively forbid it, except with the Consent of the Metropolitan and the Bishops of the Province. Secondly, *Theutgand* and *Gunthar* are very unlikely Persons to interest themselves against *Hincmar* in Favour of Pope *Nicolas*, who, as has been already said, was a severe Persecuter of them upon the Score of *Lotharius*'s Divorce, treacherously decoying them to *Rome*, and there confining them unheard; which could not be said of *Hincmar* toward *Rothard*, for he often summon'd him to plead for himself, and to clear himself of the Charge laid against him. Thirdly, I must confess these Epistles carry no Date in themselves; but being plac'd immediately after the Council of *Senlis*, which was *A. D.* 863. and the Top of the same Page bearing the same Date, I cannot conceive otherwise than that it was intended they should both bear the Date of that Year, which was the same Year that Pope *Nicolas* treated *Theutgard* and *Gunthar* so unhandsomely at *Rome*. These Inconsistencies, with the usual Practice of the Editors in palming a Plausibility upon a Fiction, make me very much suspect them upon all Occasions; and after such apparent Proofs of Disingenuity, I think they ought to be well look'd after. But notwithstanding the Editors so furiously condemn *Hincmar*, yet I cannot find that Pope *Nicolas*, or any of his Successors, in whose Pontificate *Hincmar* liv'd, treated him with any Disrespect; nay, they gave him the highest Compliments imaginable. Witness his Eighth Epistle in the Appendix of Epistles, *Labb. T.* 8. *p.* 492. where he pretends no Superiority or Coercion over *Hincmar*, but rather uses Intreaties; and in this Epistle, making Mention of a Council, *Quæ dicitur a tua Sanctitate colligi*; which, says he, is said to be gather'd by your Holiness, he does not afterward take upon him to tell *Hincmar*, the

Right of Calling and Convening Synods was ſolely in him, but acquieſces in *Hincmar*'s Diſpoſal and Management. I could Inſtance in many others of this Pope's Epiſtles to *Hincmar*, which are all very reſpectful; but let this ſuffice. However, the whole Affair between *Hincmar* and *Rothard* muſt by the Conſequence turn upon this, that tho' *Rothard* was afterwards with much Difficulty and Entreaty reſtor'd, (for it coſt Pope *Nicolas* many an Epiſtle both to King *Charles*, *Hincmar*, and the *Gallick* Biſhops) yet *Hincmar* all this while incurr'd no Cenſure, nor does the Biſhop of *Rome* pretend to any Threat, or any Thing like it; from whence it's plain, he had acted nothing irregularly, and that the Pope at that Time had no coercive Power over him. Pope *John* VIII.'s Hundred and firſt Epiſtle is as high an Encomium of *Hincmar* for his Piety and Learning as Words can expreſs. In ſhort, *Hincmar* was a Man of an unexceptionable Fame, which created him an univerſal Eſteem in his Life-time, and after his Death, as *Baronius*, *An.* 882. *n.* 7. witneſſeth; and as no Man underſtood the Canons and Rights of Church better than himſelf, ſo no Body did more bravely defend them.

We come now to the Story of *Hincmar* the Uncle, Archbiſhop of *Rhemes*, and *Hincmar* the Nephew, Biſhop of *Laon*. The Nephew was the Son of *Hincmar* of *Rhemes*'s Siſter, brought up under his Uncle. When he was of Age capable of Preferment, he was by his Uncle promoted, and by his Means made Biſhop of *Laon*; under which Character he behaved himſelf for ſome Time with a Deference becoming a Suffragan to a Metropolitan, and a Nephew to an Uncle. But he ſoon forgot his Duty in both, for he held an Abbey in another Province without conſulting his Uncle; for

for which being frequently ſummoned to a Synod, he would not obey, entertaining Perſons excommunicated by his Uncle and other Biſhops, and excommunicating People of another Dioceſs. Nor did he ſtop here, for he aſperſes his Uncle's Character with moſt unmannerly Reproaches, declaring him unworthy of the Character he bore, and threat'ning that he would have him degraded. This Carriage ſoon qualifies him for a Rebel to his King, for he endeavoured to make a Defection in *Charles*'s Subjects to the Emperor *Lotharius*; and at laſt, being impatient at the Slowneſs of his Affairs, he aſſumes the Civil Sword, and defends his wild Decrees by Force of Arms, depriving thoſe of their Goods whom he had depoſed. But that which gave him a more ſpecious Pretence of being troubleſome, was a certain Mannor formerly taken from the See of *Laon*, but by King *Charles* reſtor'd to *Hincmar* at his entring into the Epiſcopate, and afterwards by *Hincmar* deliver'd to the King, that he might beſtow it upon one *Norman*, a certain Courtier. This very Mannor *Hincmar* the Nephew demands, excommunicates *Norman*, and with an armed Force, not only takes Poſſeſſion of the Mannor, but deprives *Norman* of all his Goods. And not content with this, he accuſes *Norman* to the *Pope* as a Thief and Sacrilegious Perſon. Hereupon the Pope ſends to Archbiſhop *Hincmar* to excommunicate Count *Norman*; who underſtanding the true Cauſe of the Quarrel, wiſely refuſes it; nor would King *Charles* any Way liſten to it. *Hincmar* of *Laon* frets at this, and accuſes his Uncle and the King to the Pope of Sacrilege, and Contempt of the Apoſtolick See. About the ſame Time happen'd an Addition to this Feud, for *Hincmar* the Nephew, upon a very ſlight Occaſion, had excommunicated all the Clergy of his Dioceſs.

They appeal to their Metropolitan old *Hincmar*, Archbiſhop of *Rhemes*, who abſolves them from the Cenſure, and reſtores them to Communion and Function. *Hincmar* the Nephew ſtorms at this, threatens every Body, contemns a Synodical Summons, and openly excommunicates the King, Biſhops and Nobility. But his good old Uncle interpoſing, the King conſented to a Rehearing of theſe Things in a Synod; and in the Year 869, a Synod being called at *Wermeria*, and *Hincmar* of *Laon* not able to anſwer or clear himſelf of the Charge objected to him, thinks to evade all by appealing to the Pope. But the King and the Metropolitan would not be ſo put off. He is impriſon'd by the King, and the Year following, in open Synod, is by his Uncle and Metropolitan accus'd of Rebellion to his Sovereign, Contumacy to his Metropolitan, Injury to Count *Norman*, unjuſt Excommunication of his Clergy, and of Tyranny to his Lay-Subjects. After this he ſo manag'd the Matter with the King and his Uncle, that obliging himſelf by Oath to ſtand to the Determination of three Biſhops, whom his Uncle ſhould chooſe Judges in theſe and other Caſes, he moſt perfidiouſly flies from his Agreement, and appeals again to the Biſhop of *Rome*, who at that Time was called

[867.] *Adrian* II. a great Friend and Patron of Rebels, and Encourager of other Irregularities in the Church. But to go on with the Affair of the two *Hincmars*. Pope *Adrian* eſpouſes his Caſe with the greateſt Ardour, uſing both Entreaties and Threats with the King and old *Hincmar* in his Behalf. And tho' *Hincmar* of *Laon* openly took Part with *Charlemain*, then in Rebellion againſt the King, yet the Pope continues a ſtrenuous Patron and Aſſerter of his Intereſt. But to put an

End

End to this Feud, in the Year 871, a Council was called at *Dieuze*, in which *Hincmar* of *Laon* is accus'd by the King and his Uncle of ſeveral Crimes, where not being able to make any Defence, notwithſtanding his Appeal to *Rome*, and denying the Power of his Judges, he is by the unanimous Conſent of the Synod condemned and depoſed. I believe it ſcarcely poſſible for any Man to paint a Churchman in blacker Characters, than does the Story of this very *Hincbmar* of *Laon*, and yet ſuch a Man as he is thought worthy to be the Minion and Favourite of the Biſhop of *Rome*, tho' ſtigmatiz'd with thoſe black Crimes of Rebellion and Schiſm. This Council of *Dieuze* is very tenderly handled by the Editors. *J. Sirmondus* barely relates the Summons *Hincmar* of *Laon* received from his Uncle to appear before the Synod; and *Binius* (who muſt be meddling, tho' to no Purpoſe for, the Pope's Advantage) ſays the ſame Thing; adding moreover the Form of the Oath which *Hincmar* took to the King and his Uncle; *viz.* *I* Hincmar, *Biſhop of* Laon, *will be faithful and obedient to my Sovereign Lord King* Charles, *according to my Function, as a Man ought to be to his Sovereign, and Biſhop to his King. I likewiſe promiſe I will be obedient to* Hincmar, *Metropolitan of the Church of* Rhemes, *according to the Holy Canons*, &c. This *Binius* tells out of *Aimoinus*; but to ſoften it, he adds, That *Hincmar*, for Fear he ſhould be condemned by the Biſhops, appealed to *Rome*; to which he was prevented going by the King and *Hincmar* for ſome Time. *Labb. T.* 8. *p.* 1541. Here it is worthy obſerving, that tho' *Hincmar Junior* did appeal to *Rome*, and that being ſtop'd, the Pope wrote to the King and Archbiſhop *Hincmar* often, to let him come to the Apoſtolick See, and purge himſelf there, and likewiſe that his Accuſers ſhould appear there; yet the Pope could

not gain his Point, either in getting *Hincmar* to *Rome*, or prevent the Sentence of the Synod againſt him. Nor do I find him threatning or domineering either over the King or the Archbiſhop, but writing generally in a very friendly and ſupplicant Style, eſpecially when he is to gain any Thing; as his Epiſtles in Behalf of the Emperor *Lewis* written to *Hincmar*, to uſe his Intereſt with King *Charles* that he would not invade the Empire. But there was more in it than what has hitherto been obſerv'd; for tho' the Editors, both in the Title and Argument of this Council of *Dieuze*, leave out whom this Council was called by, and the Preſident of it, and, according to their uſual *Blind*, ſay in ſuch a Year of ſuch a Pope, (who muſt be ſet before the King) and ſuch a King; yet, according to their celebrated *Lewis Cellot* the Jeſuit, and *Flodoard*, *Hincmar* Archbiſhop of *Rhemes* was Preſident here, whom the Pope knew to be ſo exact in Point of Diſcipline, and skilful in the Laws and Canons of the Church, that he could not in Reaſon find Fault with him. And beſides, he was a Prelate of true Chriſtian Courage, and ſo bold an Aſſerter of Truth, that the Biſhop of *Rome* had Reaſon to fear an Overmatch. But he never attempts any Thing with *Hincmar* by Threat, as is ſaid already. And conſidering the State of Affairs about that Time, I do not find that the Biſhops of *Gaul* recogniz'd the Biſhop of *Rome* any otherwiſe than as a Brother Biſhop, treating one another with the Title of *Holineſs*, which was always cuſtomary both in the *Greek* and *Latin* Churches; but for any Power in calling or nulling Councils, reſcinding Decrees, and the like, the *Gallican* Church was very jealous. This is plain from the Synodal Epiſtle of the Fathers of this Council to Pope *Adrian*, wherein, after they have acquainted him with the Irregularities

ties and Crimes of *Hincmar Junior*, they desire his Consent and Confirmation, (not as the Editors would persuade, as if no Decrees were firm without the Bishop of *Rome*'s Sanction, but as was always usual for Sister Churches to confirm each others Decrees) and that *Hincmar* might not be reconcil'd or restor'd till he had retracted his Opinion, obliging the Pope to observe this Canonical Determination, which was never yet deny'd to the *Gallican* Church. I have but few Observations to make in this Pope's Pontificate, and then shall proceed to the next. In the Life of this Bishop of *Rome* it is expresly own'd, that the Emperor *Lewis* approv'd of the Election of *Adrian*: Which is a new Sort of Turn given by Design of the Editors; for the Word formerly used to be *Confirmation*; but to soften the Harshness of the Term, and lessen the Power that Word carry'd with it, they now call it *Approbation*. *Labb. T.* 8. *p.* 884. But to give the Reader an Opportunity of making an honest Observation here, I will transcribe the Passage: *The Most Christian Emperor* Lewis, *hearing the unanimous Consent, (viz.* of the *Romans) was very glad, and writing to the* Romans, *commends them for their Choice of so worthy a Person. From whence* (says this Author) *it plainly appears, that there was no Reward promis'd to any one upon his Consecration.* This is downright begging the Question, and I cannot see for what Reason this ridiculous Inference is made, but to let the World know such Practices had been too often used in the Promotion of the *Roman* Pontiffs, who ow'd their Possession of the Papal Chair more to the Power of Gold than the Recommendation and Divine Influence of the Giver of all good Gifts.

In the Subscriptions to the Council of *Dieuze* lately mentioned, there are Eight Persons who sub-

ſubſcribe in the Names of abſent Biſhops. The Terms are promiſcouſly uſed, ſometimes, *ad Vicem Domini & Patris mei*, and ſometimes *Vice Patris mei*, which are the ſame, and do plainly imply, That the Perſons ſubſcribing did ſubſcribe in the Room of their Natural, and not Spiritual Fathers; for if they had ſubſcrib'd for them as Spiritual Fathers, they would have made Uſe of ſome Eccleſiaſtick Recognition, as *Sanctiſſimi, Reverendiſſimi Patris, &c.* From whence I conclude Biſhops were married in thoſe Times.

The Irregularities of this Pope are a great Argument againſt his Infallibility. He was a great Friend to, and ſtrenous Promoter of the Intereſt of *Ignatius* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* before-mentioned, who upon his Reſtoration to his Patriarchate, ſends *Photius*'s Book, which he wrote againſt Pope *Nicolas* and the Church of *Rome*, which *Adrian* cauſes to be burnt, and lays a triple *Anathema* on *Photius* in a Synod held at *Rome* in the Year 868.

But this Dearneſs laſted not long, for *Ignatius* rouzes the old Quarrel about the *Bulgarians*, of which Pope *Adrian* complains, but to no Purpoſe. *Ignatius* inſiſts on the Rights of his Patriarchate, baniſhes the Biſhops and Presbyters ſent from *Rome* into *Bulgaria* from thence, and claims that Province as a Part of his Diſtrict. But of this more in Pope *John* VIII.'s Life.

After *Adrian* had written many Epiſtles to King *Charles* in Favour of *Hincmar* of *Laon*, in his Thirty third he laments the King's Contempt of the Apoſtolick See, diſapproves *Hincmar* of *Laon*'s Depoſition, and commands that he be ſent to *Rome*, in order to have his Sentence revers'd. The King returns a ſharp Reply to this, which ſo ſtung the Pope, that he writes again to the King, and by a long Encomium in his Praiſe, endeavours to appeaſe

peaſe him ; calls him, Defender of the Church at preſent, and promiſes him a happy Eternity with the Saints: Aſſuring him likewiſe, that he will act nothing contrary to the Council of *Nice*, and the Decrees of other Councils, in the Caſe of *Hincmar*. *Labb. T.* 8. *p.* 937, 938. So that notwithſtanding all the thundring Threats of the Biſhop of *Rome*, it cannot be found that *Hincmar* of *Rhemes* receded from any Part of the Sentence or Sentences which had paſs'd againſt his Nephew in the ſeveral Synods to which he had been conven'd ; nor is it any where to be found among the Epiſtles of Pope *Nicolas* I. or *Adrian* II. who both patroniz'd *Hincmar Junior* and his Cauſe, that either of them ſo much as threatned old *Hincmar* for proſecuting his Nephew, and their Favourite, or that he took ſo much Notice of their Epiſtles as to obey that Part of them wherein they oblige *Hincmar Junior* and his Adverſaries to appear at *Rome*, and ſtand to the Deciſion of the Pope. And though *Cabbaſutius* is not ſparing in throwing Dirt on old *Hincmar*, calling him proud, obſtinate, contumacious, *&c. p.* 351, 352, *&c.* yet from the Editors themſelves I dare juſtify this good Man, and ſhew him the Reverſe of what that Author is pleaſed to make him, and that from *Adrian*'s immediate Succeſſor,

[872.] Pope *John* VIII. who notwithſtanding the Infallibility of his Predeceſſors, diſapproves what they had done, by approving what old *Hincmar* of *Rhemes* had done in the Caſe of his Nephew of *Laon* in the 314th Epiſtle of this Pope to *Hincmar* Archbiſhop of *Rhemes*. *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 221. Which being ſo poſitive and direct a reſcinding of what had paſs'd before, and likewiſe a Confirmation of old *Hincmar*'s Proceedings, may be no unpleaſing Entertainment ; and therefore I inſert the whole Epiſtle as it is in *Labb.* aforeſaid.

CCCXIV. *To*

CCCXIV. *To* Hincmar *Archbiſhop of* Rhemes.

That there may be a Biſhop ordained to the Church of Laon *in the Place of* Hincmar.

John, Biſhop, and Servant of the Servants of God, to *Hincmar* Archbiſhop of *Rhemes.*

THough we do not in the leaſt queſtion your Holineſs's Judgment; yet becauſe our moſt beloved Son, the invincible Emperor Charles, *having inform'd us concerning the Sentence paſs'd by your Holineſs and Brethren the Biſhops againſt* Hincmar *Biſhop of* Laon, *we acknowledge it to be juſt. For we do not believe ſo great a Prince would affirm any Thing but Truth; and therefore eſteem it a Sin not to believe him.*

Defer not then to fill the vacant Church of Laon *with a fit Perſon. At which Election we would have the Emperor's Ambaſſador be preſent, to prevent any Secular Tumult. We wiſh your Holineſs Health in Chriſt.*

This Epiſtle bears Date *A. D.* 876. which was the Year after *Charles* the *Bald* was anointed and crown'd Emperor at *Rome* by Pope *John*; in Purſuance of which, ſays *Sirmondus* in his Note on this Epiſtle, (notwithſtanding Pope *Adrian* had diſapprov'd of *Hincmar Junior*'s Depoſition) about three Month's after *Hedenulf* is choſen Biſhop of *Laon.*

Return we now to that Part of the Story of *Photius* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, which relates to this Pope. *Ignatius*, as has been ſaid, being reſtor'd to the Patriarchate of *Conſtantinople*, differs with his Friend Pope *Adrian* II. about the Buſineſs of the *Bulgarians*, whom *Adrian* claim'd as Subjects to the See of *Rome*; which ſame Quarrel is reviv'd between

tween Pope *John* VIII. and *Ignatius*, the former of which ſends his Legates to the Emperor *Baſilius* and *Ignatius*, for the Recovery of that Province to the See of *Rome*, threatning them with *Anathema's* upon their Refuſal. This was *A. D.* 878. in which Year *Ignatius* dies, and *Photius* is reſtor'd, who, by the Command of the Emperor *Baſilius*, the Year following calls a Council at *Conſtantinople*, wherein *Photius*'s Reſtoration is ratified, and all former Proceedings againſt him null'd and abrogated. Things going thus in Favour of *Photius*, Pope *John* by his Legates at this Council, enters into an entire Friendſhip with *Photius*, which the firſt Canon of this Council ratifies, Pope *John* condemning all whom *Photius* had condemned, and *Photius* the ſame. Thus we ſee, what one Pope makes a flagrant Schiſm, another makes an Act of Communion; ſo that at the beſt, allowing their Infallibility, it can be no more than temporary, and dies with the Perſon.

If the Adverſaries of the Pontificate had ever ſo deliberately ſtudied to inſtance in two Men, whoſe Eminence of Character in Piety and Learning had render'd them ſuperlatively great, they could not have pitch'd upon two ſuch as *Hincmar* of *Rhemes*, and *Photius* of *Conſtantinople*, in that Age; whoſe Lives make ſo conſiderable a Figure in Story, as few *Roman* Pontiffs ever yet arriv'd to. Nor was the Intereſt of *Hincmar* in his Time (though not a Patriarch) inferior to that of the Biſhops of *Rome* his Contemporaries; for he upon all Occaſions gave a Check to that Exorbitance of Power which the Biſhop of *Rome* too often aſſumed and aſſerted. Witneſs his Book againſt the *Proedrian Papæ*, or Preference of the Pope, in *Leo* IV.'s Time. *Helvic. p.* 118.

But

But to make an End of the Story of *Photius*; let us look among the Epiſtles of Pope *John* VIII. *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 130,131. and ſo on. In the CXCIXth Epiſtle of Pope *John* to *Baſilius* and *Alexander* the Emperors, the Editors, under the Title, puts an Argument ſuitable to the Epiſtle, which begins thus: *Being mov'd* (that is, Pope *John*) *with the Entreaties of the Emperors to reſtore Peace to the Church of* Conſtantinople, *he diſpenſes with* Photius, *that he ſhould be put into the Place of* Ignatius, &c. This is their Way of begging the Queſtion, but they will find it very difficult to prove what they in the Argument aſſert, there being no Epiſtle extant among them (I mean the Editors) from the Emperors to the Pope in the Caſe of *Photius*: Beſides, *Photius* was reconcil'd to the Emperor *Baſilius*, and reſtor'd to his Patriarchate, before he and Pope *John* were made Friends, and received each other's Subjects to Communion. This Epiſtle is a ſtrange Sort of *Medly*; for, as the Editors have publiſh'd it, it ſpeaks in the Intereſt of both Patriarchates, which we will examine as they occur. *Labbé*, in the Margin, *p.* 130. tells us, that the Places corrupted by *Photius* are mark'd throughout the Epiſtle. The Firſt Note is upon a Paſſage in the Beginning, which *Labbé* ſays (*ibid.*) is left out by *Photius*; and is thus: After great Compliments for the high Reſpect the Emperors of *Conſtantinople* ever ſhew'd the See of *Rome*, he adds, *and ſubmitted all Things to her Authority*. This, ſays *Labbé*, *Photius* in his Tranſlation leaves out. But conſidering how celebrated, even by his Enemies, *Photius* was for his Piety and Intregity, and how infamous the *Roman* Editors have been for Diſingenuity and Impoſture, I doubt not but all honeſt Men will look upon this Paſſage as a Forgery of their own. The next is in *p.* 131. where they charge *Photius* with changing

of Names, and altering the Sence. Pope *John* directly, according to this Copy, charges *Photius* with *Uſurping* the Office of Patriarch, becauſe he had not acquainted him with it. Now I would know, when it was the Emperors of *Conſtantinople* called in the Biſhop of *Rome*, either to elect or confirm the Election of a Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*. This Paſſage of Uſurpation, *p.* 131. *Labbé* ſays, *Photius* has changed into a contrary Senſe, by ſaying, he was forced by the Emperor to accept of this See. Which is very probable, for *Baſilius*, who firſt made him Patriarch, and afterwards depoſed him, had a great Eſteem for him, he at that Time outſhining the Age in the moſt conſpicuous Qualifications. His illuſtrious Birth, his great Skill in Canon and Civil Laws, his Prudence and great Penetration in all Manner of Learning, were ſuch as recommended and endear'd him to the Emperor. *Nicet. in Vit. Ignat. p.* 1198. And tho' he depoſed him, and recall'd *Ignatius*, yet the Remembrance of his great Abilities ſoon recover'd him the Emperor's Favour, who was reconcil'd to him, and reſtored him to his Patriarchate. This was done without the Pope's Knowledge or Conſent, who was never allow'd any Right or Claim in the Chooſing or Creating a Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*; and conſequently there could be no Uſurpation in *Photius*. The ſame Page and the next contain nothing elſe but an Acknowledgment from *Photius*, and begging Pardon from the See of *Rome*, which in the Margin they ſay *Photius* in his Copy has left out, as likewiſe the Abſolution which Pope *John* pretends to give him and his Adherents for all paſt Miſdemeanors. Theſe Paſſages carry no Face of Credibility with them; for they look more like their own Vanity than any Omiſſion of *Photius*. In the 133d Page, *Labbé* ſeems to call his Infallible Guide to Account in the Margin,

ſay-

ſaying, *This is too large an Encomium on* Photius. This Encomium is little more than an Exhortation, wherein he adviſes the Emperor to pay *Photius* the Reverence becoming a Spiritual Father, *&c.* and therefore *Labbé* need not have been ſo ſparing of a Character and good Advice from the Biſhop of *Rome.* It is worth while to obſerve *Binius* in his Notes on this Epiſtle; for here we diſcover a very inauſpicious Blunder of his, and for which his Friend *Labbé* in the Margin condemns him. *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 134. Where he ſays, *As concerning the Occaſion of Pope* John's *writing an Epiſtle for the Abſolution and Reſtitution of* Photius, *ſee the Notes on the Life of Pope* John VIII. But here, *ibid. p.* 2. *Labbé* contradicts him in the Story of his crowning Three Emperors, telling us in the Margin, *Binius* is very much miſtaken, particularly about *Lewis the Stammering.* But this Note of *Binius* in the Page aforeſaid, makes Pope *John* a very ſcandalous Perſon in the Caſe of *Photius*, whoſe Character the Editors are reſolved to eclipſe, tho' they ruine the Pope and his Infallibility too; for the Note taxes him with foul Crimes. Photius *having fraudulently dealt* (ſays *Binius*) *with the Emperor and the Patriarch of* Jeruſalem's *Legates, is at their Importunity with the Pope, after the Death of* Ignatius, *received into the Communion of the Church, not without great Loſs of Reputation to the Patriarchal See, and heavy Scandal to the Pontifical Chair; the Pope, with the reſt of the Council at* Conſtantinople, (*which the* Romans *falſly call the Eighth General Council*) A. D. 869. *having conſtituted and ſworn not to admit* Photius *to Penitence to his Life's End.* The Pope that took this Oath we muſt ſuppoſe to be *Adrian* II. However Pope *John* VIII. breaks through it, and makes no more of his Predeceſſor's Oath, than the Editors do of Forgery; which the Notes expreſs (in my Opinion) very foully. *The Pope,* (ſay they) *neither ignorant of this*

moſt

moſt Sacred Conſtitution, nor unmindful of the Oath, inſtead of admitting a ſtubborn Heretick to Penitence, and reſtoring him to a Patriarchal See, ſhould have anathematiz'd him: But, (ſays *Binius*) *through the Interceſſion of the Emperor* Baſilius, Photius *obtained his Reſtoration*, &c. If *Binius* be in the Right, 'tis certain the Pope was in the Wrong; for he did receive *Photius* into Communion, anathematizing whom *Photius* anathematiz'd. The Beginning of the Epiſtle to *Baſilius*, *Leo* and *Alexander*, *Labbé*, *T.* 8. *p.* 134, *&c.* tells us, is wholly alter'd by *Photius*. But if this were alter'd by *Photius*, Why do they inſert it? And why do they not produce thoſe true Copies of theſe Epiſtles which the Notes ſo highly extol, *ib. p.* 134. as being by the great Providence of God preſerv'd in the Regiſter of *John* VIII. and not deſtroy'd, as the Epiſtles of many Popes have been; but were preſerv'd ſo entire, that out of them, as likewiſe out of Pope *Nicolas* and *Adrian*'s Epiſtles, *Photius* may be often convicted of Forgery and Impoſture. But this is affirming, not proving; for, as has already been hinted, let them ſum up all the Virtues and good Acts of theſe Three Popes; and the Figure which *Photius* made in the *Eaſtern* Church, will far outſhine theirs. I ſhall for Brevity-ſake omit ſeveral Paſſages which they pretend *Photius* inſerted in his Tranſlation inſtead of the Originals, and ſhall conclude with this, *viz. Oramus, &c. ib.* 139. "We beſeech your Imperial "Majeſty." This they do not like, and therefore *Labbé* in the Margin ſays, *Photius* chang'd the Word *Mandamus* into *Oramus*, and put in, *The moſt Holy Patriarch Photius*, inſtead of *Ignatius*, *ibid.* But this is moſt prepoſterous and abſurd: For the ſubject Matter of this Epiſtle relates wholly to *Photius*'s Reſtoration; therefore *Ignatius*'s Name muſt very improperly be foiſted in here. But whatever in

this Epiſtle looks favourably on *Photius*, they endeavour to diſcredit, eſpecially *Binius*, who is very ſcurrilous, calling *Photius* moſt profligate, impious Impoſtor, *&c.* But he cannot ſay worſe of an *Eaſtern* Patriarch than he does of the *Weſtern* in that Reſpect; for, as has been before obſerv'd, he makes Pope *John* none of the beſt of Men.

The CCI. Epiſtle of Pope *John* VIII. to *Photius*, looks like a Piece of Concert in Favour of the Biſhop of *Rome*, whoſe Patriarchate the Editors would have to overtop the World. *ibid. p.* 143. Pope *John* aſſerts the Right of the See of *Rome*, *viz. In the Promotion to a Private See, We ought to have been conſulted before-hand.* Which Words imply, that in the Caſe of *Photius* he was not conſulted; ſo that their own Words make againſt them. But *Labbé*, in the Margin, endeavouring to expoſe *Photius* for an Impoſtor, tells us, That *Photius* had nothing of *Conſulting the Apoſtolick See* in his Copy. So that the Impoſture turns upon themſelves; for with Impartial Judges, the Reputation of the Editors cannot ſtand in Competition with the Integrity of *Photius*.

The next Paſſage in this Epiſtle that is remarkable, is that of *Photius*'s begging Mercy in a Synod. This the Editors put down for granted, it being demanded by the Pope, ſay they, *ibid. p.* 143. according to Cuſtom. Adding further, that the moſt Chriſtian Emperor *Baſilius* having with much Importunity interceded for him, he and the reſt had unanimouſly conſented to his Reſtoration; withal promiſing Pardon and Communion to him upon his humbling himſelf in a Synod. Theſe Paſſages, *Labbé*, *ibid.* tells us, are quite left out by *Photius* in his Copy; and if he had ſaid they never had been in, he had utter'd a more proper Truth. For, in the firſt Place, they ought to prove in what

what Council this Submiſſion either had been or was to be made, which the Editors never uſed to forget, when any Thing made for the Advantage of their great *Diana* the Pontificate. But this being not proved, they muſt excuſe the Reader's Incredulity till they can ſhew ſome Authority, either in the Acts and Canons of ſome Council, or in ſome Hiſtorian of good Reputation.

The next Article is of the ſame Piece with the former, and which *Labbé* in the ſame Margin ſays was cut off by *Photius*. This was concerning the Province of *Bulgaria*, which Pope *Nicolas* I. had claim'd as his own, which of Right ow'd Canonical Obedience to the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*. This Province, *Ignatius* (tho' Pope *Nicolas* I. and he were great Friends, being both Promoters of Image-Worſhip, *&c.*) had reaſſum'd, and poſſeſs'd in Pope *Nicolas* I. and *Adrian* II.'s Time, nor did *Photius* quit the Claim to it; and therefore an Epiſtle is ſent by Pope *John* VIII. to him, to forbid any further Pretences of the Patriarchs of *Conſtantinople* to that Province, upon Pain of Excommunication. *Binius*, in his Notes on this Epiſtle, is pleaſed to be as ſcurrilous as uſually, charging *Photius* with knaviſh Dealing in his Tranſlation of this Epiſtle into *Greek*, by adding, ſubſtracting, mangling, and expunging what he thought fit, and then cauſed them to be read in his Sham-Eighth General Council. But this is like him. However he may rail at *Photius*, to advance the Greatneſs of the Patriarch of *Rome*, he will find, that Pope *John* VIII. made no greater Figure at that Time than other Patriarchs: And tho' he calls this Synod of *Conſtantinople* a Sham-Synod, yet he ought to conſider, (if it was a Sham-Synod) it was ſuch a Sham-Synod as the Pope at that Time countenanc'd by his Legates; who, notwithſtanding the

Infallibility of his Predeceſſor, by reſcinding the Acts of that *Roman* Council under *Adrian* II. and that *Conſtantinopolitan* Council under *Ignatius* againſt *Photius*, ſhews to the World, that Popes are as fallible as other Biſhops. The Patriarchs of ſeveral Parts of the *Eaſtern* Church, by their Legates, were at this Council for reſtoring *Photius*; as thoſe of *Alexandria*, *Jeruſalem*, *Antioch*, *&c.* who wrote Epiſtles to the Emperor and *Photius* too, threat'ning Anathemaes to thoſe who did not recognize *Photius* as their lawful Patriarch; all which, bating the Deference to the Patriarchate of *Rome* as the Firſt See, had equal Concern as to Power or Pre-eminency in this, or any other Synod where their Legates appeared.

The CCXXXI. Epiſtle of Pope *John* VIII. to King *Charles*, is written in the moſt humble abject Style imaginable, and argues a Power of the Secular Prince in Eccleſiaſtick Affairs, which the Editors at other Times will not allow. Where the Church indeed is incroach'd upon by the Civil Power, it is not to be excus'd; but when Patriarchs, *&c.* ſhall pretend to a Power in another Patriarchate or Province, which they dare not exerciſe within their own Diſtrict, I am ſure he muſt be look'd upon as a very inconſiderable Governor in that Diſtrict; and conſequently muſt be eſteem'd inſignificant, if not ridiculous, in another Province. A very plain Inſtance we have of this in Pope *John* VIII. if we may believe the foreſaid Epiſtle. *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 166. The Occaſion was this: The Pope had made *Conſpert* Biſhop of *Verceil*, to whoſe Ordination the King had conſented; and as for *Anſpert* Archbiſhop of *Milan*, whom the King would have abſolv'd, Pope *John* moſt humbly remonſtrates why he could not do it. *We give your Majeſty* (ſays he) *very many Thanks that you*

have

have given us free Liberty in the Affair of the Biſhoprick of Verceil, *to which by Decree of the Synod we have ordained* Conſpert. *But as for* Anſpert *Archbiſhop of* Milan, *as you commanded, we ought not to reconcile him without due Satisfaction, therefore beſeech your Goodneſs to give us no Trouble therein, being very willing in all Things to obey your Will.* This is a Style very unlike that of the Popes of *Rome*, who in a more impatient Manner afterwards were uſed to threaten Damnation to all that oppos'd them. But here Pope *John* was afraid of a Reprehenſion from the King for proceeding without his Knowledge; which, by the Way, was an Argument of a very abject Spirit in that Caſe: Nor was the Command, which the King had laid on him, any Thing leſs; for if *Anſpert* by his Irregularity had incurr'd the Cenſure of his Metropolitan, Patriarch, or a Synod, and was under any Sentence, without his Submiſſion and Satisfaction, the King's Commands could not take off his Sentence; and therefore Pope *John* was in the Right to decline the King's Command, tho' the Style and whole Bent of the Epiſtle too plainly ſhews the fearful Apprehenſions the Pope had of the King.

The Editors ſay very little in this Pope's Praiſe, whereas uſually they were wont in the Account of their Lives to extol them in the higheſt Panegyricks imaginable. But here, in *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 1. there are but three ſhort Paragraphs in all, the laſt of which makes his Holineſs but a very indifferent Caſuiſt. The Story is thus: *Adalgiſus* General of *Beneventum* having gotten the Emperor *Lewis* in his Power, the Emperor takes an Oath, never to enter the Territory of *Beneventum*, nor to take any Revenge for the Injury then offer'd him. From this Oath the Pope abſolves him by the Authority of God and St. *Peter*; affirming, that an Oath taken

Infallibility of his Predeceſſor, by reſcinding the Acts of that *Roman* Council under *Adrian* II. and that *Conſtantinopolitan* Council under *Ignatius* againſt *Photius*, ſhews to the World, that Popes are as fallible as other Biſhops. The Patriarchs of ſeveral Parts of the *Eaſtern* Church, by their Legates, were at this Council for reſtoring *Photius*; as thoſe of *Alexandria*, *Jeruſalem*, *Antioch*, *&c.* who wrote Epiſtles to the Emperor and *Photius* too, threat'ning Anathemaes to thoſe who did not recognize *Photius* as their lawful Patriarch; all which, bating the Deference to the Patriarchate of *Rome* as the Firſt See, had equal Concern as to Power or Pre-eminency in this, or any other Synod where their Legates appeared.

The CCXXXI. Epiſtle of Pope *John* VIII. to King *Charles*, is written in the moſt humble abject Style imaginable, and argues a Power of the Secular Prince in Eccleſiaſtick Affairs, which the Editors at other Times will not allow. Where the Church indeed is incroach'd upon by the Civil Power, it is not to be excus'd; but when Patriarchs, *&c.* ſhall pretend to a Power in another Patriarchate or Province, which they dare not exerciſe within their own Diſtrict, I am ſure he muſt be look'd upon as a very inconſiderable Governor in that Diſtrict; and conſequently muſt be eſteem'd inſignificant, if not ridiculous, in another Province. A very plain Inſtance we have of this in Pope *John* VIII. if we may believe the foreſaid Epiſtle. *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 166. The Occaſion was this: The Pope had made *Conſpert* Biſhop of *Verceil*, to whoſe Ordination the King had conſented; and as for *Anſpert* Archbiſhop of *Milan*, whom the King would have abſolv'd, Pope *John* moſt humbly remonſtrates why he could not do it. *We give your Majeſty* (ſays he) *very many Thanks that you have*

have given us free Liberty in the Affair of the Biſhoprick of Verceil, *to which by Decree of the Synod we have ordained* Conſpert. *But as for* Anſpert *Archbiſhop of* Milan, *as you commanded, we ought not to reconcile him without due Satisfaction, therefore beſeech your Goodneſs to give us no Trouble therein, being very willing in all Things to obey your Will.* This is a Style very unlike that of the Popes of *Rome*, who in a more impatient Manner afterwards were uſed to threaten Damnation to all that oppos'd them. But here Pope *John* was afraid of a Reprehenſion from the King for proceeding without his Knowledge; which, by the Way, was an Argument of a very abject Spirit in that Caſe: Nor was the Command, which the King had laid on him, any Thing leſs; for if *Anſpert* by his Irregularity had incurr'd the Cenſure of his Metropolitan, Patriarch, or a Synod, and was under any Sentence, without his Submiſſion and Satisfaction, the King's Commands could not take off his Sentence; and therefore Pope *John* was in the Right to decline the King's Command, tho' the Style and whole Bent of the Epiſtle too plainly ſhews the fearful Apprehenſions the Pope had of the King.

The Editors ſay very little in this Pope's Praiſe, whereas uſually they were wont in the Account of their Lives to extol them in the higheſt Panegyricks imaginable. But here, in *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 1. there are but three ſhort Paragraphs in all, the laſt of which makes his Holineſs but a very indifferent Caſuiſt. The Story is thus: *Adalgiſus* General of *Beneventum* having gotten the Emperor *Lewis* in his Power, the Emperor takes an Oath, never to enter the Territory of *Beneventum*, nor to take any Revenge for the Injury then offer'd him. From this Oath the Pope abſolves him by the Authority of God and St. *Peter*; affirming, that an Oath taken

to ſave his Life was of no Force; nor could that be called an Oath which was againſt the Good of the Commonwealth, tho' bound with ever ſo many Execrations. In his Pontificate likewiſe the *Saracens* over-ran *Naples*, and that Part of *Italy*, up to *Rome* it ſelf; inſomuch that the *Neopolitans* and *Beneventines* were forced to make a Peace with the *Saracens*; which the *Neopolitans* refuſing to violate, he threatens them with Excommunication. The like he did to the People of *Malfi* in *Italy*, to whom he wrote an Epiſtle. *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 172. Let the Condition or Occaſion of an Oath be what it will, there ought to be a very tender Regard had to Men's diſcharging themſelves from it: For where God is in ſo ſolemn a Manner call'd to Witneſs to the Intentions of Man's Heart in ſo deliberate an Act, the Perſon thus obliging and engaging himſelf to a juſt Performance of his Oath, ought to be very well aſſur'd, that that God whom he invok'd be well ſatisfied with the Authority that pretends to diſcharge him from ſuch a Sacred Obligation.

Among the Councils that were held in the Pontificate of *John* VIII. that of *Ravenna*, *A. D.* 877. is remarkable for ſeveral Things, beſides the good Canons that were therein conſtituted. This Council was called by the Pope, and he was preſent at it, tho' the Editors in the Title do not, as uſually, ſay it was under ſuch a Pope; but that the *Synod of* Ravenna *was held by* 130 *Biſhops*. *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 299. But after the Canons of this Council there immediately follows a Diploma, which *Labbé* in his Note on this Council ſays, muſt neceſſarily be granted by the Biſhops aſſembled in this Council. And the Matter is plain; for in the Beginning it ſays, *That in the Year* 877 *the Biſhops met at* Ravenna, *being called by the Authority of the Pope and Emperor, in which*

which Synod Pope John *preſided.* But inſtead of ſubſcribing to the Canons and Acts of this Council, the Biſhops ſubſcrib'd only to the Diploma, among which Pope *John* is firſt. Now, conſidering the Artifice of the Editors in Things of this Nature, we may more reaſonably expect this to be a Deſign than an Omiſſion in them: For the Pope being Preſident of this Council, ſitting in Perſon, and ſubſcribing to the Canons, they may be apt to think, it calls in Queſtion ſeveral of their irregular and uncanonical Practices in later Ages. The Fourth Canon decrees the Clergy and Religious to be under the Tuition of their Biſhops, which is very oppoſite to the Practice of Exempts, who pretend themſelves independent of Epiſcopal Juriſdiction, and pay no Allegiance to their Dioceſan. The Fourteenth Canon is founded upon the Thirty ſixth Apoſtolick Canon, which ſays, *That every one that is ordained Biſhop, Prieſt, or Deacon, ſhall undertake a Cure, or be ſuſpended till he doth.* But this Canon ſaith, *It is neceſſary that a Prieſt be ordained to a Church.* By Parity of Reaſon then, if it be requiſite that a Prieſt be ordained to a Cure or Church, much more that a Biſhop be, whoſe Charge is of greater Extent, and whoſe Dignity is ſuperior, and who cannot be a Biſhop before he is a Prieſt; How then is the Practice of creating Biſhops in the very Cradles, and Abbots (who likewiſe ought to be Prieſts) before they are Prieſts, to be juſtified? That there are ſuch Things is plain from Experience, in moſt Countries that acknowledge the Papacy; and the Space of Time is ſcarce to be call'd Years, ſince a Biſhop of the Church of *Rome* was ordained a Prieſt, who had been for ſome Time before a Biſhop of the Church of *Rome*, and an Elector of the Empire. Now, for theſe Reaſons, I am apt to think the Editors thus ſlightly paſſed

over the Pope in the Title, neither owning him there as Preſident of it, as uſually they do, (nay generally where he had nothing to do) nor annexing the Subſcriptions in their proper Place to the Canons, but at the End of the Diploma.

In the Year 878, a Council was held at *Neuſtria*, upon a Complaint of the Emperor *Lewis* III. againſt *Hugh* the Baſtard-Son of *Lotharius*, who at the Head of a tumultuous Army, after the Death of *Charles*, had invaded and laid waſt great Part of *Lewis*'s Country. Here was a fair Opportunity for the Prelate of the Firſt See to have ſhewn himſelf in Defence of an injur'd Prince againſt a lawleſs bold Invader. But the Pope is not ſo much as mentioned in all this Council, except in the Title; where it is only ſaid, *In the Time of Pope John* VIII. not under him. Beſides, from the Editors themſelves it is plain, that they thought the Buſineſs lay properly within their own Country, and among themſelves; and therefore a Synod being ſummon'd, old *Hincmar* of *Rhemes* was Preſident of it, by whom the Synod exhorted *Hugh* the Invader to Peace. *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 306. *Hincmar* of *Rhemes*, as has before been obſerv'd, was the Oracle of the *Weſtern* Church in his Time, for his great Skill in the Canon-Law, which no Biſhop underſtood better, or more bravely defended; and none of the Biſhops of *Rome* who knew him, ever pretended to reverſe the Canons or Decrees of any Synod where he preſided, without a Reprehenſion which always juſtify'd his Proceedings. But in this Caſe, which was National, and wherein there was a moſt manifeſt Violation of Right, by an illegitimate Invader, the Biſhop of *Rome* offer'd not to meddle; whether it was becauſe he knew nothing of it, or whether he thought he had nothing to do in it, I will not pretend to determine.

This

This Pope was preſent at the Second Council of *Troyes*, *A. D.* 878. upon this Occaſion: *Lambert* Count of *Spoletum* having taken *Rome*, Pope *John* flies into *France* to entreat Succour. At which Time in this Synod he complains of the ſad and heavy Oppreſſions the Church of *Rome* labour'd under through the Cruelty of Count *Lambert* and others, demanding their Concurrence in the rooting out this Evil. The Synod demand Time to conſult of the Expediency of this Affair, leaſt they ſhould proceed irregularly, (for old *Hincmar* of *Rhemes* was there) who in Behalf of the reſt of the Biſhops anſwers the Pope; *That according to the Holy Canons*, &c. *whom the Holy Mother Church of* Rome *condemned, they condemned; whom ſhe anathematiz'd, they anathematiz'd; whom ſhe received, they received, &c. Lab. T. 9. p.* 307. This Anſwer was like that Chriſtian Hero *Hincmar*; who no doubt had well weigh'd the Heinouſneſs of *Lambert* and his Confederates Crimes, that had given ſo much Diſturbance to the Church, before he gave it. In the Proem to the firſt Act of this Council, there is ſomething that carries a Face of Forgery with it, and foiſted in by ſome Body to make this appear a General Council, which neither the Editors in the Title own, nor in any Part of the Council. But this beſides was to colour the true Cauſe of the Pope's coming into *France*, which, as has been ſaid before, was to beg Aid of King *Lewis* againſt Count *Lambert*, *&c.* But in this Proem they tell us, *That the moſt Holy Father Pope* John *came into* France *to eaſe that Church of the ſeveral Oppreſſions it labour'd under.* Which could not be at that Time, or any thereabout; for the *Gallican* Church ſeldom found Diſturbance then but from ſome Biſhop of *Rome* or other, who too often ſided with rebellious Biſhops and Clergy, that flew in the Face of their Me-

Metropolitans and Princes; as has been obſerv'd in the Caſe of *Rothard* and *Hincmar* of *Laon*. But that which deſtroys this Sham-Story of the Cauſe of the Pope's coming into *France* is, that in the firſt Act of this Council, in the ſubſequent Paragraph to this Proem, the Editors make the Pope himſelf tell quite another Story; for there he complains only of the Oppreſſions which *he* ſuffer'd by ſome perverſe Men, and deſires the Concurrence of the Synod in the Cure. *ib. p.* 307. As to the Preſidence in this Council, or the Calling of it, neither are mention'd by the Editors in the Acts of it, or in the Title, which only ſays, *It was celebrated in the Year* 878, *in the Sixth Year of Pope* John VIII. *and the Firſt of* Lewis *the Stammering. Ib. p.* 306. Nor is it mentioned in the Subſcriptions, the Pope only ſubſcribing Firſt, as Prelate of the Firſt See, a Preference always allow'd to the Biſhop of *Rome*. But there is nothing ſaid of the Preſident of it, not even by *J. Sirmondus* in his Notes on it. 'Tis certain, at the Council of *Ravenna* he preſided in Perſon, and if he had preſided here, I am apt to think the Editors would not have omitted it. In this Council was *Hincmar Junior* reconciled, and in Part reſtor'd to the Church of *Laon*; being as it were a Coadjutor to *Hedenulf*, whom old *Hincmar* had put in his Nephew's Place, and at the Inſtigation of this very Pope, as has been ſaid already. But this Reconciliation was not without old *Hincmar*'s Conſent, for his Name is among the Subſcriptions of this Council. *Labb. Ib. p.* 313.

[882.] *Martin* II. ſucceeds Pope *John* VIII. whoſe Pontificate laſted few Days beyond a Year; therefore little is to be expected from him in that Time, the moſt remarkable Actions of his Life being before he was Biſhop of *Rome*. I ſhall take Notice of one, becauſe it contradicts another of the

the ſame Nature in a former Pope, which is ſtill Buffeting their Infallibility. *Labbé, T.* 9. *p.* 356. in this Pope's Life, tells us, That this *Martin*, in the Time of *Adrian* II. was join'd in Legateſhip with *Donatus* and *Stephen* to depoſe *Photius*, and reſtore *Ignatius* to the See of *Conſtantinople*; and that he preſided in that Synod, which the *Latins* call the Eighth General Council. This is very improbable, for tho' *Ignatius* concurr'd with the Patriarch of *Rome* in Image-Worſhip, yet he was as jealous of the Rights of his own See as the Biſhop of *Rome* could be; witneſs, his aſſerting and claiming the Obedience of the *Bulgarians*, which the Pope had unfairly ſtolen from the See of *Conſtantinople*. As to the Actions of this *Martin* in his Legateſhip, the Editors and Hiſtorians of their own Party can make no more of it than this, *viz.* That if Contradiction be a Note of Infallibility, no Church in the World could ever ſhow more of it than that of *Rome*; for, according to their own Accounts, *Martin*, in Commiſſion with *Donatus* and *Stephen*, did depoſe *Photius*, and reſtore *Ignatius*; whereas *Rodad* and *Zacharias*, Legates of the very ſame Pope *Adrian* II. had before ſubſcrib'd to the depoſing *Ignatius*, and inveſting *Photius* in the Patriarchate. Likewiſe in Pope *John* VIII.'s Time this *Martin* was ſent a Legate to *Conſtantinople* to repair the Miſchief which the three preceding Legates, *Peter*, *Paul* and *Eugene*, had occaſion'd in the reſtoring *Photius*. *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 356. So that there is little Certainty in the *Romiſh* Infallibility at this Rate; but leſs according to *Labbé* in the next Page; where he ſays, That Pope *Martin* reſcinded thoſe Acts which Pope *John* had raſhly done; (*perperam egerat*, are the very Words) one of which was his reſtoring *Formoſus* Biſhop of *Porta*, whom Pope *John* had depoſed, and had ſworn never to reſtore, *ibid.* And a few Lines further ſays,

ſays, *For what Cauſe he was depoſed by Pope* John, *or after what Manner reſtored by Pope* Martin, *is not plain: But however he could abſolve him* (i. e. Formoſus) *from his Oath, which had been unjuſtly extorted from him, and retract that illegal Sentence of Pope* John, *which perhaps was pronounc'd out of ſome private Grudge.* Here is a heavy Charge againſt the Supreme and Infallible Guide and Judge! No leſs than unjuſt Extortion of an Oath, illegal Sentence, and Prejudice. It's well this Author ſpoke at ſome Diſtance of Time from this Pope, who, I believe, would not have ſhewn him more Mercy than he did Favour to *Formoſus*. Indeed, this is ſuch a Concuſſion of their Infallibility as is not commonly to be met with. I have but one Obſervation more on this Pope, and then ſhall leave him. What falſe Steps of his Predeceſſor Pope *John* he had diſcover'd after his Death, we ſee from the Editors in Part; but how Pope *Martin* his Succeſſor ſhould be ſo ſevere upon his Memory I cannot conceive, except it was for his irregular and uncanonical Proceeding in conſecrating him *(Martin)* a Biſhop, but to no See. *Lab. ib. Cav. Hiſt. Lit. Par.* 1. *p.* 565. This was indeed a Ground of Prejudice to an impartial, orthodox, canonical Perſon, but the Perſon ordained of all Men ought to be ſilent. *Vid. ſupra*, in the Life of Pope *John* VIII. about the 14th Canon of the Council of *Ravenna*, *& Can. Apoſtol.* 36.

[884.] *Adrian* III. ſucceeds *Martin* II. in whoſe Pontificate there is nothing memorable, but the old Quarrel about *Photius*, which *Adrian* proſecutes with great Zeal and Fury. This Feud the Emperor *Baſilius* endeavours to reconcile; but *Adrian* carries his Reſentment ſo far, as to treat *Photius* no otherwiſe than a Layman; which ſo incenſed the Emperor, that he writes a thundering Let-

Letter back: But *Adrian* in the mean Time dies, and leaves the Quarrel to his Succeſſor

[885.] *Stephen* V. who anſwers the Emperor in as lofty Terms as he wrote; but the Emperor dies, and his Son *Leo* receives it, who ſides with the Pope againſt *Photius*, whom he forthwith depoſes, and confines to a Monaſtery, where ſoon after he dies. There are Three Epiſtles ſaid to be written by this Pope, of which the laſt looks very ſuſpicious, as *Labbé* owns, *T.* 9. *p.* 374. for it ſpeaks of *the moſt glorious Emperor* Odo, and of the Pope's coming to the Council of *Troyes*. Now who this *Odo* was, and of what Place, Emperor, is not to be found about thoſe Times, and is juſt as true as Pope *Stephanus*'s going to the Council of *Troyes*; the lateſt of which Councils of that Name was near Seven Years before he was Pope. But this Epiſtle, tho' never ſo falſe in its Chronology, ridiculous in its Nature, and even ſuſpected by themſelves, yet muſt be inſerted if it ſpeak any kind Thing of the Pontificate's Supremacy or Infallibility; and that it does plentifully; for here Pope *Stephen* would make *Selva*, to whom he writes, believe, That the ſole Diſpoſition and Determination of all Things Eccleſiaſtick are veſted in him.

In the Year 888, a Council was held at *Mentz*, without the Conſent or ſo much as Knowledge of the Biſhop of *Rome*, and upon ſo conſiderable and important Occaſions as thoſe of chooſing a King, and regulating the State of the Church, at that Time very much diſorder'd. This *Binius* owns in his Note on this Council, *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 411, 412. and that *Luitbert* the Archbiſhop preſided in it. The Biſhop of *Rome* is in no Part of this Council mentioned; the Subſcriptions being left out, or loſt; I cannot ſay which. Tho' this is to be obſerv'd, that in thoſe Councils where the Pope preſided, or at leaſt was preſent, as in thoſe of *Ravenna* and the

Se-

Second of *Troyes*, he ſubſcribes firſt. But neither Pope nor his Legate being there, *Binius* lets it paſs that *Luitbert* the Archbiſhop preſided. As to the Diſtinction which *Binius* makes in the ſame Note between the Titles of Emperor and King, it is very vain and groundleſs, and makes the Character of him true, that he will be doing tho' to no Purpoſe, or very often to do Miſchief to his own Cauſe. He ſays there, *That* Arnulphus *was by all ancient Writers called King, and not Emperor; becauſe it was not allow'd to any one to aſſume that Name, except it was given them by the Pope. ib.* He might as well have ſaid, the Pope firſt inſtituted the Title of Emperor: For *Lewis* the Firſt and Second were called Kings of *Germany* as well as Emperors, and the Office of Coronation, whether perform'd by Archbiſhop *Luitbert* or any other Biſhop, was as valid as if done by the Biſhop of *Rome*. *Cabbaſutius*, *p.* 360. is of the ſame Mind with *Binius*, as taking it from him. But if we look a little forwarder into the Reign of this King *Arnulph*, we ſhall find, that the Words, Emperor and King, were ſynonimous Terms; and this is more plain in the Third Canon of the Council of *Tribur* near *Mentz*, *A. D.* 895. where the King in his Anſwer uſes both in one Senſe; *aliter Regnum & Imperium Jure Eccleſiaſtico regere & gubernare non poſſumus*. Which Words, if they had implied any Difference, would have been diſtinguiſh'd by the Disjunctive *aut* or *vel*, inſtead of *&*.

[890.] *Formoſus* next aſcends the Papal Throne, whoſe Life was one continued Series of Miſery, and who after his Death was ſuch an Inſtance of poſthumous Cruelty as is not often to be met with in Hiſtory. By Pope *Nicolas* he was ſent a Miſſionary to inſtruct the *Bulgarians*, newly converted to the Faith, where he behav'd himſelf anſwerable to the Character he bore. And notwithſtanding the Daubings and Flattery of Sycophants, the good

Man appears in much of this Pope's Life: Which makes ſome of his Succeſſors look very black, whoſe barbarous Reſentment againſt this Pope, both before and after his Death, hath brought ſo laſting a Stain and Reproach upon their Memories, and even their belov'd Infallibility, that the moſt ſtudied Artifice of their Adverſaries could not have exceeded. To prevent any Contradiction, we will take their own Words. In the Life of this Pope, *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 427, *&c.* after the ſhort, but due Encomiums on his ſucceſsful Apoſtleſhip to the *Bulgarians*, the Author proceeds to vindicate him, by a ſevere Cenſure on Pope *John* VIII. "Who, to "his great Diſhonour, envying the good Deeds "of his Predeceſſors, (*viz.* *Nicolas* I. and *Adrian* II.) "receives *Photius*, and *Zachary* Biſhop of *Anagnia*, "the Legate, into Communion, whom thoſe two "Popes had condemned, and depoſes good *Formoſus*, whom he reduc'd to a Layman, and baniſh'd "the City, obliging him by Oath never to return "to his Biſhoprick of *Portua*, but to be content "with Lay-Communion only." This ſome People would be apt to call a very arbitrary Way of Proceeding in the *Infallible Guide*; but the Chair cannot err do what it will, tho' the Author in the following Words gives it a violent Shock; for, ſays he, "For what Reaſon Pope *John* was thus "incens'd againſt *Formoſus*, is not plain, except it was "for reprehending and admoniſhing him for his "wicked Actions; which Pope *John* might look "upon as a Sort of Rebellion, and therefore ras'd "his Name out of the Catalogue of Biſhops." This is a great Diminution of Pope *John*'s Infallible Judgment, that could not diſcern between a Chriſtian Admonition, and Rebellion. But he goes on: "*Martin* ſucceeds Pope *John*, who weighing "the Merit of the Man, raiſes him from this Diſ-

"grace,

" grace, abſolves him from his Oath, (extorted " from him by Force) and reſtores him to his for- " mer Dignity." Thus we ſee one Pope undoes what another Pope does, and yet they muſt be accounted Infallible.

By Reaſon of ſeveral Elections and Coronations, in which this Pope had ſo much intereſted himſelf, the Citizens of *Rome* were ſo prejudic'd againſt him, that he enjoy'd neither Eaſe nor Peace among them. " As to the Injuries and Diſgrace, " *ſaith my Author*, which *Stephen* VI. and *Sergius* III. " either ignorantly or maliciouſly offer'd to this " Pope, we ſhall ſpeak more of in the Life of *Ste-* " *phen* VI." To which Time I ſhall with him refer a further Account of this unhappy Pontiff; only let the Reader obſerve the Terms this Author charges upon his Infallible Judges, no leſs than Ignorance and Sacrilege.

We come next to a famous Piece of Forgery father'd on this Pope; in vindicating which, the Editors, eſpecially *Baronius*, have run themſelves into an inextricable Error; and which, by endeavouring to mend, they make worſe. They take the *Engliſh* Council, called by King *Edward Senior*, in which *Pleigmund* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* preſided, from *Malmsbury*; who ſays, it was called by the King, upon Account of the Excommunication which Pope *Formoſus* had publiſh'd againſt both King and Kingdom. In this Council it was agreed, That the vacant Biſhopricks ſhould be fill'd, and *Pleigmund* ſent to *Rome* with the King's Submiſſion and great Preſents. Whereupon *Pleigmund* returns with an Epiſtle from Pope *Formoſus* to the Biſhops of *England*, and is by him conſtituted Apoſtolical Legate. As to the Times of King *Edward*'s Reign, and the Pontificate of *Formoſus*, they are altogether irreconcileable; for according to *Regino Ab-*

bas, *Luitprand*, and *Cabbaſutius*, (who ſtretch his Life out the longeſt of any) *Formoſus* enter'd on the Pontificate in the Year 890, and with his Life, quitted it Six Years and Six Month after; whereas King *Edward* began his Reign not till the Year 901. Sir *Henry Spelman* propoſes an Expedient to heal this Miſtake. *Concil. T.* 1. *p.* 389. *by ſuppoſing the Name of* Leo V. *to be inſerted inſtead of* Formoſus, *which would ſet all right.* And indeed if it could be prov'd from Authority, not Conjecture, it would reconcile all. This Conjecture *Coſſart* rejects, by introducing one more improbable, *Labb. & Coſſar. T.* 9. *p.* 432. "For, ſays he, if the Name "of *Formoſus* were to be expung'd, Pope *John* IX. "ought to be put in his Room." It is certain King *Edward* reign'd in *England* from the Year 901, and during ſeveral Pontificates; but it is very doubtful whether Pope *John* the Ninth ſat longer than the Year 899. *Baronius* lays the Blame, and that by Conjecture too, of this Miſtake on the Librarian. But *Coſſart*, to cloſe all at laſt, ſays, if inſtead of altering the Name of the Pope, we would change the Name of the King, and put *Alfred* for *Edward*, then the Difficulty would be ſolv'd, and all Things reconcil'd. But this is no more than Conjecture, and till they can produce ſome good Authority to juſtify their Chronology, I do not conceive my ſelf or any Reader oblig'd to believe their Hiſtory. Whoever would ſee more of this, let him conſult *Papebrochius*'s *Conat. ad Chronol. Rom. Pontif. p.* 156. who calls the Second Epiſtle of Pope *Formoſus* a downright Forgery of the 11th Century.

[896.] *Sergius & Boniface* (whom *Cabbaſutius* calls the Sixth) gave great Diſturbance to poor *Formoſus*, the latter of which at laſt depos'd him, and thruſt himſelf into the Chair; but *Stepha-*

nus VI. ſoon diſpoſſeſſes him by Force. This the Editors call ſucceeding, *Stephanus Sextus ſucceſſit Formoſo, &c. Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 474. It's a Wonder they did not call it Election too, or ſoften it with ſome tender Epithet, as *Forceable Choice, &c.* Truly to give them their Due, they do not; and yet they come pretty near it, for *p.* 475. *ib.* they ſay, *All the Clergy approv'd it, and the whole Catholick Church acknowledg'd him Chriſt's Vicar, and Succeſſor of St.* Peter. And yet the ſame Author, in the very antecedent Line, calls him *(ſc. Stephen* VI.*)* the moſt wicked of Men; and tells us, he is reckon'd in the Papal Catalogue to prevent the Danger of Schiſm. Now conſidering the high Qualifications of theſe two Competitors, *Boniface* VI. and *Stephen* VI. I cannot ſee how the Catholick Church could be in Danger of a Schiſm more by one than by the other; for both were Invaders, and did not ſtick to raviſh this Holy Diadem from another, whether rightful Poſſeſſor or no; only *Stephen* depos'd an Intruder, whereas *Boniface* uſurp'd on a lawful Biſhop. And yet the Author, *p.* 474. *ib.* calls *Boniface, Homo nefarius* only; but *p.* 475. *ib.* he calls *Stephen, Homo ſceleſtiſſimus.* And truly, conſidering the ſubſequent Actions of *Stephen*, he was a moſt monſtrous Wretch; for in the Year 897, he calls a Council at *Rome*, at which Pope *Formoſus*, tho' dead and buried, muſt appear; therefore being moſt unnaturally dug up, he is dragg'd to the Council, where being plac'd in the Pontifical Chair, he is diveſted of the Holy Garments, having three of his Fingers cut off, with ſuch other inhumane Treatment as this Butcher could afford, his Body was thrown into the *Tyber*, and all his Acts reſcinded. But my Author goes further ſtill, *ibid.* He falls foul on *Onuphrius*, in his Annotations on *Platina*, for rejecting this barbarous Story as fabulous, which

which is confirm'd by ſo good Authority as *Luitprand* and others. He then aggravates the Crime of Pope *Stephen*, ſaying, he added Sin to Sin, by giving a Sanction to his Wickedneſs in a Synod; that the very Stones would curſe him, and that it were better he were ſton'd than that the Church of *Rome* ſhould be depreſs'd by ſuch a Scandal; that the Pope's chief Palace in the *Lateran* fell to the Ground, as not being able to ſtand, when the chief Stone of its Corner was ſhaken by ſo horrid a Fact. But at laſt, ſays he, the Hereticks of our Age, not without Reaſon, reproach us with this wicked Act of that *Sacrilegious Pontiff, ibid. But yet, tho' Pope* Stephen VI. *was ſo wicked a Man, they ought not to inſult us againſt the Promiſes of Chriſt made to St.* Peter *and his Church; for all that* Stephen *ſaid or did againſt* Formoſus, *were meer Acts of Frenzy or Fury; but as he was lawfully inveſted with the Pontifical Authority, he could not err againſt the Faith and good Morals, ib. p.* 476. How they can call Pope *Stephanus*'s forcible Entrance on the Pontificate a legal Inveſtiture, I cannot conceive; for he was at beſt but an Intruder on an Intruder and Murderer; and becauſe he was wanting in the Part of the Murder of Pope *Formoſus* living, he goes as far as Poſſibility can allow, and butchers him after his Death. Thus Murder is good Morals, and Uſurpation and Invaſion, if they ſucceed, make a legal Inveſtiture; which muſt be afterwards approv'd, and the Perſon, tho' a moſt unnatural Monſter, be acknowledg'd Chriſt's Vicar and St. *Peter*'s Succeſſor. But Divine Vengeance ſoon overtook this Pope, for in the Year 900, he is thrown into Priſon, where he was quickly after ſtrangled. There are two Epiſtles tack'd to this Life, the laſt of which is to the Archbiſhop of *Narbon* in *France*, complaining of the great Privileges the *Jews* enjoy'd among them.

This Epiſtle was firſt publiſh'd by *Catellus* in his Commentaries of *Septimania*, and attributed to Pope *Stephen* VI. tho' by ſome it is ſuppos'd to be *Stephen* VIII.'s, by others, *Stephen* V.'s. But be it whoſe it will, or aſcrib'd to whom, is no Matter, the End for which it was either truly written or forg'd is plain, *viz.* To ſhew the Power of the Supream Judge, tho' the moſt execrable Wretch be in Poſſeſſion of the Chair.

In the Year 897, a Synod was called at *Rome*, in which, as is ſaid before, it was reſolv'd to dig up *Formoſus*'s dead Body, throw it into the *Tyber*, and reſcind his Acts; for which Fact the Pope and his Complices are call'd by the Editors, and eſpecially *Baronius*, (from whom they take the Words) *Homines perditiſſimi, & Pontificiæ Sepulturæ Violatores. Baron. An.* 897. *n.* 6. *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 478. This I look upon to be a Sort of Miſcarriage in the *Infallibility*; for certainly he muſt be very looſe, nay moſt profligate, and void of all Principles of Morality and Chriſtianity, who by ſuch execrable Crimes muſt deſerve the Epithets of *Moſt Wicked*, and *Violator of the Grave*. The Editors diſcover their Partiality in this Council in the Title; for, in the firſt Place, they call it *Conciliabulum Romanum*; whereas at other Times, and on other Occaſions, they never talk of a *Roman* Council, but they tell you that it was *Concilium*, and not *Conciliabulum*; and that it was held, as well as call'd, by ſuch or ſuch a Pope; whereas in this there is no Mention of Pope *Stephen* VI. not ſo much as in the Title. How obſcure ſoever they would have it, Pope

[898.] *John* IX. in the Year 904, in a Council at *Rome*, damns all the Acts of *Stephen* VI. againſt *Formoſus*; and in another the ſame Year at *Ravenna*, of 74 Biſhops, he confirms all *Formoſus*'s Ordinations, condemns his Predeceſſor *Stephen* VI. and his

Roman Council, reſtoring thoſe *Stephen* had depoſed, and depoſing thoſe he had ordained, at the ſame Time paying a due Veneration to the Memory of Pope *Formoſus*. But the Council of *Rome* in the Seventh Canon, the moſt abſolutely of any, ſtrikes at the Infallibility in theſe Words: *For ſince what was done in the foreſaid Council* (*i. e.* in the *Roman* Council under *Stephen* VI.) *was contrary to Canonical Authority, by a general Conſent let it be burned.*

Sirmondus oppoſes the Editors very ſtrenuouſly about the forementioned Council of *Ravenna*; making it out, that the Canons which they pretend were made at the Council of *Ravenna*, were made in the Firſt *Roman* Council of this Century. *Labb. T.* 9. *in Append. p.* 1237. But let theſe Canons be made in which Council they pleaſe, they detract very much from the Papal Supremacy; and plainly ſhew they come ſhort of the Arrogance of the more modern Pontificate in Temporals. The Firſt Canon excommunicates all Violators of Canons, and Holy Decrees of the Fathers and Emperors. This is from the Pope and the Synod. The Second and Third, which confirm all Privileges granted to the Church and her Clergy, and prohibit all Invaſions and Incroachments from the Laity, are enjoined by the Emperor only. The other Seven, which are wholly applicatory to the Emperor for Redreſs of Grievances, are penn'd in the moſt ſupplicating Style that can be; as is plain from Can. V. VI. VII. VIII. IX. *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 509.

[906.] This Year Pope *Leo* V. ſucceeds *Benedict* IV. from whoſe Pontificate proceeded a Series of Invaſion and Uſurpation. *Leo* ſat but Forty Days, for being thruſt out of the Pontifical Chair by *Chriſtopher*, he is caſt into Priſon, where the Editors leave him. *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 515.

Pope *Chriſtopher* enjoys not this ill-gotten Honour long; for after Seven Month's Space, he is by *Sergius* depoſed, bound, and caſt into Priſon: Soon after which he is compell'd to take up with a Monaſtick Habit and Life. *Chriſtopher* and *Sergius* III. are both called Invaders of the Holy Apoſtolick See by the Editors, *ibid.* but eſpecially *Sergius*, in whoſe Life they are not ſparing of Invectives, *ibid. p.* 517. calling him, *A Slave to all Vice, and the moſt villainous of Men.* And yet, notwithſtanding this black Character, with the Addition of his invading and obtaining the Papacy by Fraud and Force, they ſay and affirm this can be no Prejudice to the Church; for that ſuch Popes as theſe are in the Sence of the Church to be call'd Apoſtates, and not Apoſtolick. I grant, that the Wickedneſs of Man ought not to be eſteem'd a Prejudice to the Church; and I queſtion not in the leaſt, but the wiſe Providence of God permits wicked Governors both in Church and State for ſome great and good End. But when I read the Hiſtory of ſuch wicked Men as *Chriſtopher* and *Sergius*, *&c.* painted in ſo black Colours as all the Malice of Man cannot exceed, tho' I allow their wicked Actions affect not the Church and Faith of *Chriſt*, yet they muſt excuſe me if I allow not ſuch notorious Sinners the Title of *Infallible*; for after all their Subterfuges, tho' the Church cannot fail, I am ſure ſuch Governors may, becauſe I know they have fail'd, as has been egregiouſly made manifeſt. But this is with Deſign to obviate and take off a greater Scandal; which we ſhall hear more of in the Pontificate of Pope *John* X.

In the laſt Year of *Sergius* III.'s Pontificate, *viz. A. D.* 909. *Herivey* Archbiſhop of *Rhemes*, and his Suffragans, held a Council at *Troſſo* in *Tuſcany*; where, upon the Foot of the ancient Canons of

both

both the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern* Churches, they conſtituted Fifteen excellent new ones relating to Eccleſiaſtick Diſcipline. But I do not find that Pope *Sergius* had any Thing to do in this Council, either by himſelf or Legates, tho' it was ſo near him; for the Title plainly tells us, *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 510. that, *It was celebrated by* Herivey *and his Suffragans in the Time of Pope* Sergius, *&c.* and by the Subſcriptions, in which *Herivey*'s Name is firſt, neither the Pope nor his Legate's Name being underwritten, I cannot ſee who but *Herivey* call'd and preſided in this Council. Had it been otherwiſe, the Editors would not have ſpared to let us know, either in the Title or Subſcriptions.

There is one Paſſage very remarkable in this Pope's Life, and which plainly manifeſts, that if Infallibility were to be ſuppoſed inherent to Perſons or their Character, the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* had a better Claim, conſidering his Proceeding, than Pope *Sergius* III. Of whom, though the Editors ſpeak many foul Things, yet they leave this Story out of his Life; *viz.* That when the Emperor *Leo*, ſirnam'd the *Wiſe*, had married a Fourth Wife, *Nicolas* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* refuſed to confirm the Marriage, as being contrary to the Canons, and a particular Conſtitution of this very Emperor; and not only depos'd *Thomas* the Prieſt that married them, but excommunicated the Emperor himſelf. For which, and his reſolute perſiſting in the Sentence he had pronounc'd, he is confined to a Monaſtery. This Story is more at large in the Epiſtle of *Nicolas* to the Pope, *Labb. T.* 9. *in Append. p.* 1264, *&c.* wherein he expoſtulates with him about the Injuſtice of the Action, and complains of the Pope's Legates, who join'd with the Emperor's Party in Confirming this Marriage. So that how foul and ſcandalous ſo-

ever this Marriage was, (for which I refer the Reader to that Epiſtle, which makes it bad enough) it is plain, that what Patriarch *Nicolas* refuſed as irregular and uncanonical, Patriarch *Sergius* never refus'd; (for he it muſt be, according to *Baronius*, who diſpens'd with the Emperor in this hopeful Match) tho' this Epiſtle of *Nicolas* is not directed by Name to any Pope, only in General to the Pope of Old *Rome*. It may not be unworthy the Reader's While to caſt an Eye upon one Part of this Epiſtle, *ib. p.* 1266. which relates to the Irregularity of this Marriage, and in which the good Patriarch, with an honeſt Freedom, blames the Practice of the *Weſtern* Church, which allows too great a Latitude in often marrying. "There are "not wanting thoſe, ſays he, who, to colour their "Error, call this Matrimony, and not Fornication. "But can the impure Aſſociating with a Fourth "Woman be called Matrimony? And is it not of"fering the greateſt Violence to Words to cloak "ſuch foul Laſciviouſneſs with ſo honeſt a Name? "St. *Paul* ſays, *Marriage is honourable, and the Bed "undefiled*: Why then do the Holy Canons caſt "thoſe out of the Church who diſhonour it? "And why do they call ſuch doing, brutal Luſt, "and exceeding the Bounds of humane Nature? "And yet, if we may believe Report, this is the "Cuſtom of the *Romans*, who, by Vertue of an "inexhauſtible Stock of Diſpenſations, allow Men "to take a Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, or as many as they "pleaſe, baſely perverting that Saying of the Apoſtle, *It is better to marry, than to burn*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 9. "making him a Patron of Luſt and Incontinence, "who does not ſo much as perſuade all People to "marry, when he ſaith, *To the unmarried and Wi"dows, it is good for them that they abide ſo; but if "they cannot contain, let them marry. ib.* 89. But this

"Per-

" Permiſſion for Widows to marry again, is in " Conſideration of the Weakneſs of their Sex, but " is not allow'd to Men. For, if a Fourth Mar- " riage were allowable, why does *Clement*, the " Diſciple and Hearer of St. *Peter* ſo openly con- " demn it, in theſe Words: *Firſt Marriage is conſo-* " *nant to Nature and the Law, Second Marriage after* " *Promiſe is unlawful, Third Marriage argues Inconti-* " *nency; and what exceeds the Third, is direct Fornica-* " *tion. Lib. Apocryph.* But the Offender here is not " a Subject, but a Sovereign, whoſe Will muſt not " be contradicted. Very fine! Muſt therefore " they that excel in Dignity excel in Wickedneſs? " By the ſame Reaſon, we ought to neglect the " Head to take Care of the Feet, *&c.*" Through-out this Epiſtle there is an Air of true primitive Chriſtian Courage, that durſt ſpeak the Truth in the Face of Kings, tho' Ruine was the certain Conſequence of it, and reprove the *Weſtern* Patriarch for his irregular Practices in the Caſe of Marriage; which Reprehenſion he ſeconds with the Authority of *St. Paul*, and *Clement* his Diſciple.

[910, 912.] *Anaſtaſius* III. and *Lando* make but a poor Figure among their Brethren; only *Lando*, at the Inſtigation and Importunity of a famous Courtezan, makes *John*, a Presbyter of the Church of *Ravenna*, and her Minion, Biſhop of *Bononia*, and ſoon after Archbiſhop of *Ravenna*: For which *John* quickly rewards him, for, by the Help of *Theodora* the Courtezan, he depoſes *Lando*, and thruſts himſelf into the Pontifical Chair, by the Name of

[913.] *John* X. tho' by the Editors at the ſame Time call'd Sham-Pope, confederate with a Strumpet, and Invader of the Holy See; yet, after an infamous and long Invective againſt his ſcandalous Familiarity with this *Theodora*, they tell us, that

Pope

Pope *John* being very much troubled in Conſcience for his paſt wicked Life, ſends to *Siſenand* Biſhop of *Compoſtella*, to deſire him to pray to St. *James* to pray to God for him; adding in the Margin, That the Acts of Pope *John* make it appear, that he was not confirm'd in the Pontificate till after Pennance: So that by this we are to believe, That the Infallibility does not commence upon the Conſecration of a Pope, but upon his Confirmation. *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 570. This is ſuch a Fetch, as nothing can be more ridiculous. But how infallible ſoever they are pleaſed to call their Pontiff, I am ſure from their own Accounts, they are guilty of very groſs Miſtakes and Irregularities, and which by Cuſtom and Practice have grown into confirm'd Precedents. We have before taken Notice of creating Biſhops in the Cradle; and here, in this Pope's Life, we have another Inſtance; for in the Year 926, he by his *Diploma* confirms *Hugh*, the Son of Count *Herbert*, a Child of Five Years of Age, Archbiſhop of *Rhemes*; which Cuſtom, as has been already ſaid, has been too ſtrictly obſerv'd, and prevails in thoſe Countries that profeſs the Church of *Rome* to this Day. And what leſs can be expected from ſo hopeful a Precedent as this infallible Guide. But it is Time to leave this Heap of Scandal. After he had held the Pontificate Sixteen Years, it pleaſed God out of his very Sin to raiſe an Inſtrument of his Puniſhment; for *Wido* Marquis of *Tuſcany*, at the Perſuaſion of *Marozia*, (who had been formerly the Proſtitute of *Sergius* III. *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 571.) depoſes him, and throws him into Priſon, where not long after he was ſtrangled. Thus, ſay they, *p. ibid.* as an Invader and unjuſt Detainer of the Apoſtolick See, he received a Reward worthy of his Wickedneſs; and as by the Means of a lewd Strumpet he violently

aviſh'd the Holy See, by the Means of another Strumpet, and Daughter of the former, he receiv'd his Reward. *Luitprand, Flodoard, Baronius.*

Hitherto in this Century the Church had put on but a melancholy Aſpect, all her Affairs running into Diſorder and Confuſion. Few learned Writers adorn'd this Age, and there was ſcarce a Council held about any Thing of Moment, or worthy Remembrance. Horrid Schiſms defac'd the Church, and the deteſtable Lives and Acts of the Popes brought much Scandal and Diſgrace on the Chriſtian Commonwealth. So that *Baronius, ad An.* 900. *n.* 1. might juſtly call this the *Unhappy and Obſcure Age.* However, what we find in our Way worthy of noting we will ſet down.

During the Pontificate of *John* X. which was 16 Years, there were but Seven Councils held, and thoſe were in *Germany,* in none of which is this Pope mentioned. In the Second Council of *Troſſo, A. D.* 921. *Herivey* preſided, who had excommunicated Count *Hertbald* for ſeveral Outrages: Who dying under this Sentence, at the Importunity of the King the Sentence is remitted. *Seulfus* the Archbiſhop preſided in the Third Council of *Troſſo, Flodoard. Chron. An.* 924. and the Fourth Council of *Troſſo* was called by Count *Heribert*: So that neither in the Title or Body of any of theſe Councils is Pope *John* X. named. If they urge in Defence of this, that being only a *Pſeudopope,* as the Editors call him, *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 569. they would not ſet him at the Head of any Council, I would know why they do not expunge him out of the Catalogue of Popes? I know their only Anſwer to that muſt be, That ſuch a Vacancy as the Space of 16 Years would make a wide Gap in their Succeſſion, which muſt not be; and therefore to prevent that, they will ſupply it at any Rate, tho' with the moſt profligate

ſligate Wretches. Undoubtedly thoſe few good Governors of the Church that lived in this barren Age, could not but abhor ſuch deteſtable Monſters as *Sergius* III. *John* X. *&c.* and therefore did not communicate any Affairs of the Church to them; from whom they could expect no Good.

[929.] *Leo* VI. had ſcarce ſat a Year when he was depos'd, and thruſt into Priſon. Pope *Stephen* VII. who ſucceeded him, ſat two Years; but there's no more ſaid of either by the Editors.

[931.] The next that takes the Chair is one whom they ought to call a Devil, inſtead of Pſeudopope; and yet he muſt be inſerted in the Catalogue of the Popes; though, according to their own Confeſſion, the vileſt, blackeſt Monſter that ever yet defiled the Holy Purple. This was Pope *John* XI. Son of Pope *Sergius* III. by the Strumpet *Marozia*, (a bleſſed Stock to take an Infallible Guide from!) by whoſe Means he was intruded into the Place of *Stephen* VII. though, beſides all other Impediments, he was incapable of that high Office in the Church through Want of Years. This Pontificate was a Series of Debaucheries, Inceſt, *&c.* which would offend the modeſt Reader to repeat: At the End of which, Divine Juſtice purſues the Cauſe; for *Alberic*, another Son of *Marozia*, routs his inceſtuous Father-in-Law *Hugo*, takes his Mother *Marozia* Priſoner, and his Brother *John* the *Pſeudopope*, whom he confines in Priſon; where, after he had defil'd, not govern'd, the Apoſtolick See for near Five Years, he expir'd. *Lab. T. 9. p. 591.*

[936, 939, 943.] As for the Three next Popes, *viz. Leo* VII. *Stephen* VIII. and *Martin* III. the Editors ſay ſo little of them, that it is ſcarce worth while to mention any of them. I ſhall therefore paſs to

[946.] Pope

[946.] Pope *Agapetus* II. of whom the Editors ſay as little as of the former. There is only this Obſervation to be made, that to ſhew his Infallibility, in the Caſe of *Hugo* and *Artald*, Competitors for the Archbiſhoprick of *Rhemes* in the Year 947, he declar'd for *Hugo*, and in the Year 948 he confirms *Artald* in the Archbiſhoprick.

[955.] The Life of Pope *John* XII. begins with as unlucky a Step as any of the former. *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 640. It tells us, that due Age, and all other Qualifications requiſite in a lawful Pope, were wanting in him; yet, notwithſtanding theſe Deficiencies, to prevent a Schiſm in the Church, he is by the General Conſent of the Clergy choſen Pope. His Want of Age was Objection ſufficient of it ſelf againſt his Election, for he was not full Eighteen, which was very uncanonical. He was a Man of ſuch profligate Morals, that he left nothing unattempted that might ſerve his Luſt or Ambition; for either for Murder, Adultery, or Tyranny, he might diſpute Precedency with *Nero* or *Caligula*. And to crown theſe impious Qualifications, he was ungrateful, treacherous, and perfidious to the higheſt Degree: For, after he had unſucceſſfully made War with *Pandulph* Prince of *Capua*, and that *Berengarius*, without Diſtinction, had invaded and waſted *Italy*; upon his Application to the Emperor *Otho* for Aid, he received ſuch Aſſiſtance as ſoon quieted *Italy*. The Emperor having thus ſucceſsfully freed *Italy* from Invaders, repairs to *Rome*, where he is magnificently received and entertain'd. The Emperor, in Return for this, confers vaſt Preſents and Gifts on the Church, beſides the Addition of ſeveral Cities, together with the Confirmation of all the Privileges of the *Roman* Church. Upon this, the Pope and all the Nobility of *Rome* ſwear upon the Body of St. *Peter*, That they would ne-

never take Part with *Berengarius* and *Adelbert* againſt him. And thus the Emperor departs quietly for *Papia*; where he had not long been, but Pope *John*, forgetting his Oath, revolts from the Emperor, and joins with *Adelbert*. But the Emperor no ſooner approaches *Rome*, than Pope *John* and *Adelbert* quit it; at which Time, ſays *Luitprand*, the Citizens received the Emperor and his Army into *Rome*, and ſwore Fidelity to him; adding moreover, (and that upon Oath, that they would never hereafter chooſe any one Pope without the Conſent and Approbation of the Emperor and his Son King *Otho*. Three Days after a Synod is called, and *Leo* VIII. is made Pope in the Room of *John* XII. who, upon the Emperor's Departure, returns, depoſes *Leo* as an Invader and Intruder into the Holy See, and reſcinds all that was done by his Adulterer (as he calls him). There was no leſs than Three ſeveral Councils called at *Rome* upon this Occaſion. The Firſt was called by the Emperor *Otho*, *A. D.* 963. wherein *John* is depoſed, and *Leo* put in his Place. The Second was called by *John*, *A. D.* 964. in which *Leo* is depoſed and condemn'd as a Schiſmatick. The Third was called the ſame Year by the Emperor, in which *Leo* recovers the Pontificate, at which Time Pope *Benedict* V. was in Poſſeſſion of the Chair, but is depoſed and baniſh'd to *Hamburgh* by *Leo*, where he dy'd in Exile. The Author of the Lives of the Popes in *Labbé* indeed does not take any particular Notice of *Leo* VIII. by himſelf, only ſpeaking of him *in tranſitu*, in the Lives of Pope *John* XII. and Pope *Benedict* V. So likewiſe does *Cabbaſutius*, *Regino Abbas*, and others. But conſidering the black Characters they have deſcrib'd ſeveral of his Predeceſſors in, (to mention no more than his immediate Predeceſſor Pope *John* XII.) and how irregular,

lar, uncanonical, and unqualified they render them; nay, tho' Invaders, and ſometimes Murderers one of another, I do not ſee why *Leo* VIII. not quite ſo wicked as ſome of his Anteceſſors, ſhould be only called a Pſeudopope.

There is one Thing above the reſt very remarkable in the Life of Pope *John* XII. and which we have the Editors Word for, *viz.* This Pope was the firſt ſince St. *Peter* that chang'd his Name, which before was *Octavian*; but upon his Advancement to the Papacy, he aſſum'd that of *John*. A very pious Precedent truly, and worthy his Succeſſors' Imitation! Eſpecially if we conſider his infamous Death, to which it is high Time to bring the Miſcreant, and which we will take from the Author's own Words, *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 641. who quotes *Luitprand* for his Authority. "One Night, whilſt he "was ſolacing himſelf with another Man's Wife "in the Suburbs, he was in the very Inſtant of "Time ſmitten by the Devil, of which Wound "he in Eight Days Time dy'd." A Criminal worthy of ſuch an Executioner! But after all theſe horrid Crimes and Sins committed by Pope *John* XII. the Author ſays, "Tho' theſe Things "ſeem to be ſtrain'd to the utmoſt Degree by "*Luitprand*, yet I will not queſtion the Truth of "them; becauſe, bad as they are, they can give "no Damage or Scandal to the Catholick Faith; "for we all own, that St. *Peter* and his Succeſſors, "after they had received the Promiſe of Chriſt, "might err in Morals, but not in Faith." So that Pope *John*, tho' an adulterous Tyrant, *&c.* after he became St. *Peter*'s Succeſſor, (though he ſtole in like a Thief) could not err, but continued a good Catholick. But I would ask this charitable Author, Whether a Man that is guilty of Perjury, can or ought to be reckon'd in the Number of the Faithful?

ful? (For this he hath ſaid that Pope *John* had been, when he ſware upon the Body of St. *Peter*, that he would never engage with *Berengarius* and *Adelbert* againſt the Emperor:) Or, Whether a Man that had ſolemnly, as in taking an Oath, called God to Witneſs, and had ſtipulated with his Maker for his Salvation upon the Condition of his Keeping or Breaking that Oath; I ſay, whether upon the Breach of ſuch Oath, he is not guilty of the Breach of the Chriſtian Faith? If we expect to be ſaved by the Goſpel in our Conformity to it, undoubtedly we renounce the Covenant contained therein, upon the Breach of any Obligation we called God and his Goſpel ſo ſolemnly to Witneſs.

To the other infamous Actions of Pope *John* XII. I ſhall add this one, and have done with him; *Luitprand*, *l.* 6. upon very good Authority, tells us, That this Pope ordain'd a Deacon in a Stable among his Horſes. This *Baronius*, *ad An.* 963. endeavours all he can to invalidate; but *Luitprand* confirms it by Two Witneſſes, *John* Biſhop of *Narnium* in *Italy*, and *John* Cardinal Deacon; who did teſtify in a *Roman* Council, in the Preſence of *Otho* the Emperor, *Se vidiſſe illum Diaconum ordinaſſe in Equorum Stabulo*: *That they themſelves did ſee him, with their own Eyes, ordain a Deacon in a Stable of Horſes.*

[964.] Pope *Benedict* V. is next in Courſe, but there is nothing more remarkable of him, than has already been ſaid in the Life of Pope *John* XII. nor indeed of any elſe till *Gregory* V. except of *Boniface* VII. whom they call *Pſeudopope*, who twice made his Way to the Papal Chair thro' Blood; firſt by the Murder of *Benedict* VI. *A. D.* 972. and next by the Death of *John* XIV. *A. D.* 984. whom he ſtarv'd in Priſon. This *John* XIV. was the ſecond that chang'd his Name, in Imitation of his Predeceſſor

ceſſor *John* XII. (a precious Example to imitate!) for his true Name was *Peter*.

[996.] *Gregory* V. muſt follow the Faſhion, and inſtead of *Bruno*, which was his right Name, calls himſelf *Gregory* V. He, like too many of his Predeceſſors, cannot get Poſſeſſion of the Papal Chair without much Tumult and Miſchief. Being Nephew to the Emperor *Otho* III. or at leſt conſanguineouſly related to him, he eſpouſes his Cauſe againſt *John* XVI. whom *Creſcentius* Governor of *Rome* had ſet up in Oppoſition to *Gregory*. But when the Emperor approach'd *Rome* with his Army, *Creſcentius* flies, and leaves poor Pope *John* to the Fury of his Competitor; who, tho' a Churchman, could not ſhew the leaſt Charity to his Rival, but cauſes him to be treated in a moſt barbarous Manner, (as they tell it) for having his Hands and Ears cut off, and his Eyes put out, they ſet him upon an Aſs, forcing him to ride through the City in this mangled Condition, and all the Way he paſs'd to utter this Expreſſion: *Such Puniſhment hath he who dethrones the Pope of* Rome. *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 751. This Story carries ſo much Horror in the Face of it, that if it be true, Nature muſt ſhrink at the Report of it: And beſides, if this ſententious Palinody of poor Pope *John* were to have been put in Execution, many of the *Roman* Pontiffs before and after this Time had found Employment for Aſſes and Executioners. But according to the Manner of the Author of this Pope *Gregory*'s Life's telling the Story, *Lab. ib.* there is ſo much of the Leaven of a *Popiſh Legend* in it, that I muſt beg the Editor's Pardon for not believing this Story. I will relate it in their own Words: "After this butcherly Mangling and Diſmembring "poor Pope *John*, *viz.* by cutting off his Hands "and Ears, and putting out his Eyes, they ſet him

" upon an Aſs, holding in his Hands (*which were* " *before cut off*) the Tail of another Aſs that went " before as his Guide, they drove him through the " City, *&c.*" This is ſo apparent a Blunder, that I cannot conceive how it could paſs the Editors; and ſo irreconcileable to Reaſon, that none but ſuch Biggots can believe. But I'll be ſo good natur'd for once, as to think they tell this idle Tale on Purpoſe to invalidate the Barbarity of the Fact.

The Pontificate of this *Gregory* V. is as remarkable for the foreſaid ridiculous Story, and a Forgery in the ſubſequent Part of this Pope's Life, as the Life of any Pope hitherto. Theſe two Fictions take up the greateſt Part of the Narrative; but the latter is ſo conſiderable, that nothing of greater Moment could be invented in Secular Affairs than it; and this grand Impoſture they uſher in with the uſual Solemnity and Formality of a Council. In the Year 996, there was a Council called at *Rome* by *Gregory* V. upon the Complaint of *Herluin* Biſhop of *Cambray* for ſeveral Injuries done to his Church, which were redreſs'd, and the Invaders of the Church excommunicated. This was the true and genuine Occaſion of this Council at *Rome*, *Baldric. Epiſcopi Noviomenſ. Chron. l.* 1. *c.* 3. and which the Editors in the Appendix, *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 1245. acknowledge in Part, allowing the Caſe of *Herluin*, and ſubjoining the Grant of Pope *Gregory* V. to it. But in the Title they unfairly ſtyle this, *An Addition to the* Roman *Council in the Year* 996, making this real Truth an Appendage to their Forgery, whereas it was the ſole Cauſe of the Council's Meeting. The Title of this Council, according to the Editors, *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 757. runs thus: *The Council of* Rome, *in which it was decreed, That for the Time to come the Emperor ſhould be choſen by Seven Electors, Princes of* Germany. *Held in the Year* 996. *In the Time*

Time of Gregory V. *Pope.* For Proof of this the Editors can produce no other than *Baronius*'s ſingle Authority, which conſiſts of Five Reaſons: The Firſt is, That in Affairs of great Moment the Fathers and Biſhops in Council were conſulted. This I grant, but deny the Conſequence he draws from it, *viz.* That therefore the Electors derive their Power of Electing from *Gregory* V.

The Second Reaſon, to prove this Grant of Election from the Pope, is, That at this ſame Time there was a Synod at *Rome.* This I likewiſe grant, tho' it was held upon another Occaſion, as has been already prov'd.

The Third Reaſon is, That the Biſhop of *Rome* granted to *Otho the Great* the Liberty of chooſing his Succeſſor, which other Emperors wanted. This is hard to prove, for *Otho the Great* liv'd in the Beginning of the Tenth Century, being Emperor in the Year 937, and dy'd near 40 Years before *Gregory* V. was Pope. But to make this out a little better, they tell us, there is a Decree of *Leo* VIII. extant, wherein it appears, that to induce *Otho* to relieve the Church of *Rome* from the Tyranny it labour'd under, he promiſes him the Privilege of chooſing his Succeſſor. What's this to the Purpoſe of the Seven Electors? Or if it were, of what Authority could it be, ſince all the *Romiſh* Editors and Hiſtorians call this *Leo* VIII. a Pſeudopope, and allow him no Room in their Catalogue?

The Fourth Aſſertion, or Reaſon, is by Way of Alluſion, and, in my Opinion, very improperly applied; *viz.* That as the Empire was by the Authority of the Biſhop of *Rome* tranſlated from the *Eaſt* to the *Weſt*, ſo the Right of chooſing the Emperor was granted to the *Germans* by the ſame Power. This Alluſion (tho' falſe in all its Parts) they pretend to ſupport with a Citation out of Pope *Inno-*

cent III.'s Epiſtle to the Duke of *Duringen* in *Saxony*, which recognizes the foreſaid Grant. But this Epiſtle muſt be at leſt 200 Years after, and therefore of no Authority in this Caſe; beſides, it mentions unluckily the Emperor *Charlemain*, in whoſe Family the Imperial Diadem continued 100 Years, without the Aſſiſtance of the Biſhop of *Rome* to confirm or grant to them the Power of naming their Succeſſors.

The Fifth Reaſon is a very poſitive Aſſertion, more eaſily affirm'd than prov'd; which ſays, That the Power of chooſing the Emperor was granted to the Electors by none but Pope *Gregory* V. But the Authority which ſhould give this the Sanction is wanting, and which *Baronius* laments, ſaying, That if the Acts of this Council were but extant, it would be an eaſy Matter to prove what Sort of *Grant* this was that was given by the Pope to the Electors, whether in general to all the Princes of *Germany*, or only to Six or Seven particular Princes. But the Acts of this Council being loſt, how is it poſſible to know the Nature of this Grant? As for the Conjecture of *Baronius*, or any elſe, it is no Rule, eſpecially when the Conſequences they draw them from are taken from very falſe Principles. But as to this laſt Aſſertion, it is very improbable that *Otho* III. who had advanc'd *Gregory* to the Papal Chair, ſhould ſuffer him to ſubvert a Succeſſion by which he came to the Empire. It had been common to this very Time for Princes to make Popes, (of which this *Gregory* V. is the lateſt Inſtance) but not very uſual for Popes to make Kings or Emperors. Thus far I think it is plain that this *Roman* Council was called upon another Occaſion, *viz.* upon the Complaint of *Herluin* Biſhop of *Cambray*, and not in the Affair of the Electors of the Empire. But to ſet this Affair right, I dare affirm

this

this to be the Truth of the Story: It was in this very Pope's Time, that the Manner of electing the Emperor was founded, and therefore the Editors lay their Scheme of it accordingly, and father it upon a Council, which, it is moſt certain, was called and held upon another Occaſion. For near 200 Years after *Charlemain*, there was no certain or regular Way of Election; the Emperors in their Life-time nominating and recommending their Sons or Kinſmen to the *German* Princes: But about the End of the Tenth Century, the *Romans* began to inſiſt upon their ancient Right of Election. This was like to kindle into a Flame on both Sides of the Hills, for the *Germans* were as obſtinate as the *Italians*. But *Otho* III. a prudent Prince, found out an Expedient to prevent this Miſchief, which was ready to burſt into a Flame; for he procured a Couſin of his to be created Pope, by the Name of *Gregory* V. who being a *German* born, was eaſily induc'd to confirm the Chooſing of the *Weſtern Emperor* to the *German* Nation. This ſo highly diſguſted ſome of the *Italian* Princes, that they depoſed *Gregory*, and ſet up *John* in his Room; but the Emperor returns with an Army, diſplaces and ſeverely handles his Enemies, and replaces his Couſin *Gregory* V. in *St. Peter's* Chair with Triumph. *Otho* being victoriouſly return'd to *Germany*, propoſes to the Princes the Multiplicity of Inconveniencies and Incumbrances that attended the uncertain and uneſtabliſh'd Way of chooſing an Emperor and his immediate Succeſſor, and deſir'd them to conſider of a more regular Method. After many mature Deliberations and Opinions, they agreed upon a *Septemvirat*; *viz.* Seven Princes, who ſhould be inveſted with a plenary Power to elect an Emperor and his next Succeſſor. Hereupon a College of Electors was founded and conſtituted, all

to be within the Pale of the *German* Empire. Application being made to the Pope, he not only approv'd of this Buſineſs, but was ready to confirm it, provided that Three of the ſaid Electors were Eccleſiaſticks: Which was accordingly agreed to, and not by Way of Council, as the Editors vainly pretend; for *Otho* the Emperor had concerted this Thing before, but could not ſo eaſily bring the *Italians* to comply with him as when a Creature of his was at the Head of them, as his Couſin Pope *Gregory* V. was.

[999.] *Gerbert*, upon his Advancement to the Papacy, like ſome of his *Pious* Predeceſſors, changes his Name to that of *Silveſter* II. He had not long embrac'd the Order of St. *Benedict*, but he is invited to Court, to take upon him the Charge and Education of *Hugh*, Son of *Robert* King of *France*; where he ſo cautiouſly behav'd himſelf, that he gain'd the Eſteem of both thoſe Princes: In the latter of which he had ſo intire an Intereſt and Influence, that a Council being called at *Rhemes*, *A. D.* 991. he procur'd *Arnulph*, the rightful Biſhop to be depoſed, and himſelf ordain'd in his Room.

For this, Pope *John* XV. excommunicates him, and the Biſhops that were preſent at this Council, and in the Year 995, in another Council at *Rhemes*, he procures *Arnulph* to be reſtored, and *Gerbert* to be depoſed; which ſo enrag'd him, that he by a high Hand, having obtained the Intereſt of the Emperor *Otho*, and the Favour of the People, is conſtituted Archbiſhop of *Ravenna*. Hitherto he continued a violent Oppoſer of, and an implacable Enemy to the Pontificate. The Author of this Pope's Life, *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 775. gives him a very indifferent Character in the former Part of his Life, calls the Council of *Rhemes*, which depos'd *Arnulph* and advanc'd *Gerbert*, a *Pſeudoſynod*; and

and adds, that being depoſed, he fled to the Emperor *Otho*. His flying in the Face of the Holy Apoſtolick See, which by *Fraud, Lies, &c. p. ibid he had calumniated*, and the Injuries he had offer'd to *Arnulph*, were but indifferent Qualifications for a Candidate for the Papacy; therefore the Author thinks it neceſſary to wipe theſe Scandals off in Time, leſt they ſhould dry and grow indelible. *It's plain*, ſays he, *he did Pennance for theſe Crimes, becauſe he afterwards ſo behav'd himſelf, that the Emperor and People of* Ravenna *thought him worthy of that Archbiſhoprick, and that* Gregory V. *ſo highly approv'd of him, that he could deny him neither Ordination nor the Pall. ib.* But before we bring him to the Pontificate of *Rome*, it will be of Uſe as well as Satisfaction to the Reader, to know what theſe Affronts to the Holy See were; which nothing makes ſo plain as the Epiſtles of this *Gerbert*, and publiſh'd by the Editors, *Lab. ib. p.* 743, 744, *&c.* before which there is alſo an Epiſtle of *Hugh* King of the *Franks* to Pope *John* XV. to the ſame Purpoſe, in which he juſtifies the Proceedings againſt *Arnulph*, queſtions his Holineſs's Sagacity much, by *deſiring him not to miſtake Things doubtful for certain, and* (tho' he had called the Council of *Rhemes*, which depoſed *Arnulph* and promoted *Gerbert*) *will not acknowledge himſelf to have acted any Thing againſt the Apoſtolick See. ibid.*

The Second Epiſtle is that of *Gerbert* to *Conſtantine* the Abbot; wherein he cautions him againſt the Encroachments of the Pope's Legat, bids him look to himſelf, for, *When his Neighbour's Houſe is on Fire, he is not out of Danger.* Tells him, *The Conſequence is plain, for not only the Dignity and Veneration of the Holy Prieſthood was in Danger, but the State of the Kingdom.* Denies the Supremacy, ſaying, *That without the Conſent of the Biſhops, (ſc.* in Council) *he*

neither could nor ought to deprive a Biſhop, tho' a wicked Man. ibid. p. 744. alledging at the End, by Way of Maxim, in Oppoſition both to the Infallibility and Supremacy, *That Matter of Fact ought not to depend upon the Indulgence of the Judges, but upon Truth. ibid.*

The Third Epiſtle is from the ſame *Gerbert* to *Siguinus* Archbiſhop of *Sens*, whom he endeavours to prejudice all he can againſt the Sentence of the Court of *Rome*. The whole Epiſtle being one continued Series of Invectives againſt the Infallibility and Supremacy, we will excerp the moſt remarkable. It begins thus: "Your Prudence ought "to beware the Subtilties of crafty Men, and to "hearken to the Voice of the Lord. *If they ſay "unto you, Behold here is Chriſt, or there is Chriſt, do "not believe them. Mat.* 24. 23. At *Rome*, they ſay, "there is one that can juſtify what you condemn, "and condemn what you juſtify. *But it is God that "juſtifieth.* How then can our Adverſaries in the de- "poſing *Arnulph* ſay, We ought to wait for the "Determination of the Biſhop of *Rome*? Will "they make us believe, that the Judgment of the "Biſhop of *Rome* is greater than that of God? "But the Firſt Biſhop of *Rome*, and Prince of the "Apoſtles, cry'd, *Acts* 5. 29. *we ought rather to obey "God than Men.* And the great Apoſtle, *Galat.* 1. 8. "ſays, *If any one ſhall preach unto you other than what "we have preach'd, tho' an Angel from Heaven, let him "be accurs'd.*" Here it is to be obſerv'd, that the Editors in the Margin inſert theſe Words, Gerbert *forgets thoſe Words of the Lord,* "*Whatſoever "they ſhall ſay unto you, obſerve and do; but do not as "they do.*" But whether *Gerbert* had this Text in his Head or not, he goes on, and falls not a little foul on the Infallibility. "What, ſays he, tho' "Pope *Marcellinus* ſacrific'd to *Jupiter*, muſt there- "fore all other Biſhops ſacrifice? I poſitively affirm,

"That

" That if the Biſhop of *Rome* ſhall offend againſt " a Brother, and being often admoniſh'd, will not " hear the Church, I ſay, this very Biſhop of " *Rome*, according to the Word of God, ought to " be regarded no more than a Heathen or a Pub- " lican. For the higher his Station is, the greater " his Fall." The reſt of this Epiſtle is made up of Citations out of ſeveral Popes, which are urg'd in Contradiction to the Practice of the Biſhop of *Rome* at that Time. *ib. p.* 745.

Upon the Death of *Gregory* V. a Kinſman of the Emperor *Otho*, *Gerbert*, another Couſin of the Emperor, is choſen Pope, who, as has been ſaid, chang'd his Name to that of *Sylveſter* II. The Author of this Pope's Life, in endeavouring to conceal the Manner of his being choſen, lays open the whole Cheat, and plainly proves this Pope, as well as his Predeceſſor, to be choſen by the Emperor's Means. *He was promoted to the Pontificate*, ſays he, *by the Patronage and Intereſt of the Emperor* Otho III. *Tho'* Aimoinus, l. 5. c. 45. *writes, That he was choſen by the People, who, without Doubt, were very willing to oblige the Emperor. But*, continues he, *I believe the Emperor did countenance him, becauſe he was his Kinſman.* I am very much of the Author's Opinion in this Part of the Story, but can't agree with him in that idle Tale he pretends to take from *Ditmar*, which would make us believe, that *Gerbert*, before he was Pope, had endar'd himſelf to the Emperor by an admirable Piece of Clockwork. It's certain ſo politick a Prince as *Otho* made Popes for other Ends than their Skill in Mechaniſm, and whoſe Abilities were not to be circumſcrib'd within the Bounds of regular Motion, like that of Clocks, but muſt occaſionally anſwer all Ends. It is agreed on, by all that mention this Pope, that he had a polite and ingenuous Edu-

Education, being eminent for his great Knowledge in Philoſophy and Aſtrology. But whether this, or any other Reaſon, gave Occaſion to Cardinal *Benno* to ſtigmatize Pope *Silveſter* II. with the Study of Magick, and that he pawn'd his Soul to the Devil to obtain the Papacy, I ſhall not determine, but leave the Reader to judge from the Editors partial and unreaſonable Inferences. An ill Name with them is half Conviction; for which Reaſon no Author muſt be allow'd to ſpeak the Truth, (tho' ever ſo palpable) that hath once written againſt them. And therefore *Baronius*, and all the Favourers of the Pontificate, caſt all the vile Reproaches and Calumny imaginable on *Benno*. The Author of this Pope's Life, *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 775. ſays, That *Benno* called himſelf *Cardinal-Archpresbyter*; but, whatever that Author may ſay, it's certain, *Benno* was created *Cardinal-Archpresbyter* by *Clement* III. formerly called *Guibert*, whom, tho' they call Antipope, as being put in by the Emperor *Henry* IV. yet conſidering their former Manner of electing and creating Popes, either by the Emperor, or bribing the People, (as has been often hinted) I cannot ſee that any Pope for many Years came in upon a juſter Foot than *Clement* III. and for this we have the Editors own Words. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 4, 5. "*Henry* IV. not complying in all Things "with the Pope, (*ſc. Gregory* VII.) is, with ſeveral "Biſhops excommunicated by him; and tho' they "were ſeemingly reconcil'd, yet the Breach ſoon "became wider than ever, for *Rodolph* of *Sweden* "is invited in by the Princes of *Germany*, (*without* "Gregory's *Knowledge*, *ſay they*) and choſen King; "but the Emperor *Henry* ſubduing *Rodolph*, be-"gan to deſpiſe the Pope more than before. Up-"on which he, in a Synod at *Rome*, *A. D.* 1080. "excommunicates and depoſes *Henry*, and tranſ-

"fers

" fers the Crown to *Rodolph*, on this Condition, " That hereafter no Lay-Perſons ſhould claim or " confer the Inveſtiture of Eccleſiaſtick Benefices. " *Henry* hearing this, calls a Council at *Breſcia* in " *Italy*, wherein *Gregory* is depoſed, and *Guibert* " choſen in his Room. And purſuing this Reſolu- " tion, he takes the City of *Rome*, and creates " *Guibert* Pope by the Name of *Clement* III." So that conſidering Circumſtances, the Emperor had Reaſon of his Side; for if Rebellion be a Crime, this Pope was highly guilty, notwithſtanding his Infallibility, and deſerv'd to be depriv'd of Life as much as of the Pontificate. But their Way of Stifling a Story is very pleaſant; for, after ſome general Reflections on *Benno*, they tell us, *Labb. T. 9. p. 776. It is Refutation enough of a Story to know the Author.* A poor Way of Anſwering! But of this Story, the Reader may ſee more in the Life of *Hildebrand*, written by *Benno*.

Till *Silveſter* was by the Favour of the Emperor made Pope, he was the moſt violent Champion of his Time againſt the Papacy; but, like ſeveral of his Predeceſſors, the Advantages of Supremacy and Infallibility ſoon inform'd his Judgment. There are Three Epiſtles which bear his Name as Pope, the Second of which, to *Arnulph*, according to *Coſſart*'s Note, cannot be *Silveſter*'s, *Lab. T. 9. p. 778.* but *Gregory*'s, and that the Miſtake crept in through the Ignorance or Careleſneſs of the Librarian. *For*, ſays *Coſſart*, *is it likely that* Silveſter *ſhould ſo judicially reſtore* Arnulph *to his Archbiſhoprick, whom he had for Crimes before depos'd, and which Sentence he left atteſted by ſuch publick Monuments?* Beſides, there are ſome Paſſages which contradict its being *Silveſter*'s, one of which is, *ut quia tua Abdicatio Romano Aſſenſu caruit, Romanæ Pietatis Munere credatis poſſe reparari.* It's very improbable that *Silveſter*, who was the

Oc-

Occaſion of *Arnulph*'s Depoſition, (which was done without the Conſent of the Biſhop of *Rome*) ſhould pretend to make Reparation as Biſhop of *Rome*, when what he had acted in the Caſe of *Arnulph* was done and maintain'd in Contempt of the Biſhop of *Rome*. But there is greater Reaſon to ſuſpect the Truth of the Firſt and Second Epiſtles of this Pope than what we have yet urg'd. *The Firſt*, ſays *Binius* in his Note on it, *was written by* Gerbert *before he was Pope, and found in the Library of* Papirius Maſſan *after his Death, which I have here inſerted to preſerve from Periſhing*. Were this ever ſo certain a Truth, it could not take off the juſt Ground of Suſpicion contained in the Epiſtle it ſelf. Firſt, the Editors cannot agree about the Name of the Perſon to whom it is written, the Title calling him *Azolin*, the Margin correcting it, and calling him *Aſcelin*: But we'll wave that. Secondly, in the Epiſtle, he reproaching this *Azolin* with ſeveral Faults, ſays, *That being invited by the Archbiſhops of* Turen *and* Rhemes *to the Synod of* Compeigne, *he acknowledges his Offence, and begs Pardon*, &c. This is a moſt undeniable Proof of its Falſhood, for it is moſt certain, that no Council was held at *Compeigne* from the Year 833, till the Year 1085.

The Second Epiſtle is pretended to be recover'd by *Sirmondus*, and by him tranſcrib'd out of the Book of *S. Remigius*, Archbiſhop of *Rhemes*. This *Labbé*, *T.* 9. *p.* 778. ſays in the Margin, and that it was never publiſh'd before. Indeed I believe him. Nor can I conceive how this Epiſtle ſhould be in *S. Remigius* of *Rhemes*'s Book, who is allow'd to have dy'd *A. D.* 545. I will not charge *Sirmondus* with ſuch an Error, but rather meaſure this Epiſtle by the Title, and the ſubject Matter; both which give the Biſhop of *Rome* ſole Power of reſtoring

ſtoring a depoſed Biſhop to his See. It is ſo particular in the Form of it, that it looks more like a primary Inſtitution or Ordination of a Biſhop than a Reſtoration, in which there was not that Occaſion of mentioning ſo many Particulars; *viz.* the Staff and Ring, the Uſe of the Pall, Privileges, Monaſteries, *&c.* all which of Courſe return'd to the reſtor'd Biſhop. But *Coſſart*, in the Note aforeſaid, plainly ſhews the Neceſſity of this Epiſtle, which was to ſhew the Nullity of the Fact in *Arnulph*'s Depoſition; *For*, ſays he, *the Pope was oblig'd to take off the Condemnation, (ſc.* of *Arnulph) not becauſe it was injuſt in it ſelf, but becauſe it wanted the* Roman *Sanction. ib. p.* 778. So that, tho' this Sentence had been injuſt, if it had received its Sanction from *Rome* it had been valid. But the true Reaſon is, The Council of *Rhemes*, *A. D.* 991. in which *Arnulph* was depoſed, being called by the King, and inſiſted on by him, as has been ſaid, there was a Neceſſity of trumping up ſome Sham-Authority to maintain that Power which ſince has been claim'd by the *Roman* See, *viz.* that no Council ſhould be allow'd of that was not called or confirm'd by the Biſhop of *Rome*, and that no Biſhop could be reſtored without his Authority.

[1000.] We are now come to the Eleventh Century, which was remarkable for the great Encroachments made by the Court of *Rome*, both on Church and State. About the Beginning of it the *Sacramental Controverſy* grew warm, at the Inſtigation of *Leutheric* Archbiſhop of *Sens*, which was afterwards carried on by *Berengarius* Archdeacon of *Angiers*. In this Century likewiſe the Emperor *Henry* IV. and Pope *Gregory* VII. quarrel'd about Inveſtitures and other Rights of the Regale, which Pope *Gregory*, partly by Force, and partly by Eccleſiaſtical Cenſures, extorted from the Emperor; who

by

by thus quitting his Ground, ſoon gave Way to greater Encroachments; for the Pope having carried his Point in the former, inſiſts on the Right of Supremacy in the Apoſtolick See over all, even Kings themſelves, advancing by theſe Means the Prerogative of the Papal Chair above the Imperial. Hereupon *Henry* IV. is excommunicated in a *Roman* Synod, and ſoon after depoſed, and *Rodolph* of *Sweden* put in his Room. In this Century likewiſe a hot Diſpute aroſe between the Patriarchs of *Rome* and *Conſtantinople* about the Right of Supremacy. In the Middle of it, the Inſtitution of Cardinals was enlarged, who being formerly only as Clergy fix'd and intituled to particular Churches, were about this Time eſtabliſh'd into an Apoſtolick College, made Counſellors to the Pope, Judges, Senators, *&c.* But of theſe in their proper Courſe of Time.

There is very little ſaid of the Pontificate of *John* XVII. and XVIII. by the Editors; nor is there much more ſaid of

[1009.] *Sergius* IV. Only this is remarkable in the ſhort Account they give of this Pope's Life; *viz.* "That whereas he was called *Peter* before he "was created Pope, out of Reſpect to the Apo-"ſtolick Dignity, he chang'd his Name to that of "*Sergius*, as appears by the Sepulchral Inſcription "in the *Lateran*:

——— *Mutato permanſit Nomine Præſul*
Sergius ex Petro. ———

Labb. T. 9. *p.* 802, 803.

But with this Author's Leave, if there were any Weight in Names, I ſhould look upon the Name of *Peter* to be much more Apoſtolical and venerable than that of *Sergius*. And altho' he takes Oc-

caſion to quarrel with *Ditmar*, for aſſerting, that this Pope took on him the Name of *Sergius*, becauſe he did not like his own, which was *Buccaporci*, or *Swine's-cheek*; yet, *ibid. p.* 802. he makes Uſe of the ſame *Ditmar*'s Authority to confirm the Story of a Shower of Oil, which fell in a certain Church at *Rome*, a Veſſel of which was ſent to the Emperor *Henry*.

[1012.] *Benedict* VIII. ſucceeds *Sergius*, who is no ſooner created Pope, but by *Gregory* his Anti-pope, and the *Romans*, he is expell'd the City; whereupon he flies to the Emperor, then in *Saxony*, who repairing to *Rome* with an Army, routs *Gregory* and reſtores *Benedict*.

In the Year 1021, there was a Council called at *Salingſtede* near *Francfort* in *Germany*, in the Caſe of Morals and Eccleſiaſtick Diſcipline. This Council has the uſual Varniſh in the Title, *viz.* In the Time of Pope *Benedict* VIII. and the Emperor *Henry*. But the Preface is more plain, and ſays it was called by *Aribo* Archbiſhop of *Mentz* and other Biſhops, 11 *Id. Aug.* in the 20th Year of *Henry* as King, and 6th as Emperor. *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 844. the Pope being not named in the Preface, nor in the Council, but with an Exception; as we ſhall ſee.

Upon a Complaint in this Council, that ſome weak Presbyters had ſuperſtitiouſly uſed to caſt the *Corporale* or Linnen-Altar-Cloth into Fires to extinguiſh them; this Council, upon Pain of Anathematization, forbad it. This was a ſuperſtitious Cuſtom that had in ſeveral Places prevail'd, which the Fathers in this Council wiſely condemn'd in the Sixth Canon of it.

The 18th Canon of this Council treads hard upon the late aſſum'd Prerogative of the Infallibility of the Pontificate. To make this more plain, take the Words of the Canon from the Editors:

" Where-

" Whereas many are ſo fooliſhly perſwaded, that " in any capital Crime they will not receive any " Pennance from their own Prieſts, believing, that " if they go to *Rome*, the Apoſtolick Father can " remit all their Sins; it ſeems good to this Holy " Council, that ſuch Indulgence is of no Advan- " tage to them; but rather let them perform the " Pennance enjoined them by their proper Prieſts, " and then, if they will go to *Rome*, let them ask " Leave of their proper Biſhop, and take Letters " from them to the Apoſtolick Father." Here is a plain Renunciation of the Papal Infallibility; and whilſt this Cannon reprehends the People for a wrong Application, in going to *Rome* only for Pennance, it charges the Biſhop of *Rome* with Irregularity, who by this Action encroaches upon the Liberty and Prerogative of other Churches, which the Canons and Councils of all Ages hitherto forbad any to invade, but to be content within their own Limits.

The 19th Canon forbids any Incroachment likewiſe in the Penitent, " obliging him during " the Performance of his *Carrinæ*, or 40 *Days Faſt*, " not to ramble from Place to Place, but to ſtay " in the Place where he received his Pennance, " that his proper Prieſt may be his Witneſs: But " in Caſe of Neceſſity by hoſtile Injuries he can- " not perform his Pennance, his own Prieſt may " recommend him to ſome other Brother, where " he may quietly perform his Faſt." This Cannon likewiſe gives the ſame Check to the Encroachments of *Rome* as the former, not allowing the Penitent to go to *Rome* in Caſe of Neceſſity, but to perform his Pennance where his own Prieſt ſhall recommend or direct.

The Council of *Mentz* was call'd the Year following by the ſame *Aribo* Archbiſhop thereof. This *Surius*, in the Life of S. *Gothard*, *cap.* 22. calls a General Council, in theſe Words: " *Aribo* Archbiſhop of *Mentz* invited the Emperor that Year " to keep his Pentecoſt there, where he likewiſe " called a General Council, *&c.*" Theſe Words are very Nonſenſe in themſelves; for *Aribo* being but Archbiſhop of *Mentz*, could only call a Provincial Council; and therefore do much wonder at the great Overſight of *Labbé*, *T.* 9. *p.* 854. that he ſhould let this paſs without ſome Colour or Exception, ſince in *T.* 2. *p.* 3, *&* 65. he ſays, there cannot be a General Council except the Pope preſide in it by himſelf or his Legates. But it is moſt evident, that Pope *Benedict* preſided in this Council neither by himſelf nor his Legates, nor did he ſo much as call this Council, which themſelves own.

[1024.] *John* XIX. enters the Pontificate very ſcandalouſly, according to the Account the Editors give of him; " invading the Apoſtolick See " (ſay they) with the Power of Princes and a vaſt " Largeſs of Money. But by the ſingular Provi" dence of God, being admoniſhed by Letters " from *William* Abbot of the Monaſtery of S. *Be*" *nign*, he underſtood that he held the Pontificate " unjuſtly; therefore doing Pennance, he abdica" ted himſelf, and then was choſen anew." *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 855. Here is a fine Turn to preſerve Succeſſion and Infallibility! There is not a Century to this very Time, ſince the Church of Chriſt was form'd into Diſcipline, but in repeated Canons condemns this wicked Practice of acquiring Benefices by Gifts, many of them depriving the Tranſgreſſor of both Epiſcopal and Sacerdotal Office for ever: Nor can this wretched Evaſion wipe off

the Infamy; for when this Pope had once renounc'd, or abdicated, as they call it, he ought to have forborn ever profaning the holy Purple by his vile Approaches to it. When God permits such lewd Abominations to be practis'd, it looks as if his Providence (which they in this Case profanely boast of) had forsaken St. *Peter*'s Chair, and had given the Possession of it up to their own wild Imaginations.

To the End of this Pope's Life the Editors subjoin an Epistle of the foresaid *William* Abbot of St. *Benign* of *Dijon* to Pope *John* upon this Occasion. William *having heard, that the Title of* Universal *was granted by Pope* John *to the Church of* Constantinople, *he chides him for it.* This is the Title of the Epistle, *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 855. And truly, whoever the Author is, he deals very plainly with his Holiness upon the Matter, and endeavours to set his Infallibility right. "There is a Report (says "he) at which he that hears it cannot but be "scandaliz'd: For since the Power of the *Roman* "Empire, which formerly flourished in a Monar-"chial State, is now managed by many Scepters, "the Power of binding and loosing in Heaven "and Earth is devolved on the Magisterial Power "of St. *Peter.*" This is a special Derivation of Power, and as wisely applied! But as if his Infallibility wanted Instruction, he goes on: "And "for the future we desire you would act as be-"comes the Universal Bishop in the Discipline of "the Holy and Apostolick See." *Ibid.* The Editors, in the Life of this Pope, and in the Epistle, agree exactly in their Account of the Affair of the Church of *Constantinople*, desiring to be entitled *Universal*, both citing *Glaber*, *L.* 4. *c.* 1. But *Cossart* will not let it pass without a little more Plausibility, lest People should think that Pope *John* had made

made a falſe Step, and granted the *Greek* Church their Requeſt; for (ſay they) in this Pope's Life, "the *Greeks* ſent their Legates on this Errand well "loaded with Preſents:" A Charm the Biſhops of *Rome* in thoſe Days could not reſiſt. And therefore *Coſſart* ſays, "That this was only a falſe Re-"port: Not but that Pope *John* did labour to "bring the Matter about, but was deterr'd by the "Letters of the Gallican Biſhops, and eſpecially "of this Abbot *William.*" It is not worth while to trifle away any more Time about this Story, only to ſhew the Diſingenuity of the Editors: For in the firſt Place, the Story it ſelf is much to be queſtion'd. Nor is it reaſonable for any Man to believe that People would court and ſue for what they had many Years before been inveſted with by a more lawfull Authority: For the Second General Council of *Conſtantinople* gives this Church the Firſt Poſt of Honour after that of *Rome*; as appears in *Can.* III. And the Fourth General Council at *Chalcedon* ſpeaks plainer, *Can.* V. and ſays, "The "Biſhop of *New Rome* (meaning *Conſtantinople*) "ſhall enjoy the ſame Honours with that of Old "*Rome*, upon Account of the Tranſlation of the Empire." This Canon and the Two following are left out of the Collection of *Joannes Antiochenus*, and the Latin Verſion of *Dionyſius Exiguus*. They are likewiſe left out by *Peter Crab* and *Longus a Coriolano*; and *Cabbaſutius* argues very furiouſly againſt their Validity; for it is plain from this Canon, that the See of *Conſtantinople* paid no Submiſſion to that of *Rome*, nor any Reſpect by Way of Superiority: For, as Biſhop *Beveridge* has moſt learnedly obſerved in his Annotation on this Canon, the Reaſon of the Fathers giving this Honour to the See of *Rome*, was not becauſe it was the Seat of St. *Peter*, or becauſe the Biſhop of

Rome is Christ's Vicar, but because it was the Imperial City, or Seat of the Empire. The Words of the Canon plainly make this to be the Sense of the Fathers, *propter Imperii Translationem*; *by Reason of the Translation of the Empire*; assigning that and no other as the Reason.

Secondly, *Cossart* in his Note on this Epistle gives a very odd Reason for the Writing of it. "From "the false Report (says he) *William* took the Oc- "casion of Writing." In so solemn a Case as this seem'd to be, if true, and in such distant Circumstances as those between a Patriarch and an Abbot, a Man may reasonably be thought to take his Cause of Writing from a better Hand than that of common Fame, which is too often a common Lyar.

Thirdly, *Baronius* may be said to give this Story as mortal a Blow as any Thing else, though he does it a sideway: For speaking of *Glaber*, who hands this Epistle to the Editors, he says; "Tho' "he was careful in reviewing his History, yet he "was guilty of many Errors, (in Judgment, I "suppose he means) for he will not allow the "*Roman* Pontiff any more Power in another's "Diocese than other Bishops, who are circum- "scrib'd within their proper Bounds, beyond "which they cannot act." For my Part, I cannot conceive what End this Epistle answers, except that of recognizing the pretended Universality of *Rome*; though by admitting the Increpations of Abbot *William*, it shocks the Infallibility.

The Editors, *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 861. foists in a Council, which does not deserve the Name; which they pretend to take from the *Hildesheim* Chronicle. But that which is most to be wonder'd at, is, they let this Author pass without a Note, or any Chastisement. This Council is by the forefaid Chronicle

nicle call'd, *The General Synod of* Palithi, *in which the Emperor preſided.* This is quite wrong, according to the Poſition they have ſo often laid down, *viz.* That there can be no General Council without the Pope's Calling and Preſiding in, either by himſelf or his Legates.

[1033.] Pope *Benedict* IX. is obtruded on the Apoſtolick Chair by Force, as his Predeceſſor was, which he moſt ſcandalouſly poſſeſs'd for Eleven Years. This the Author of this Pope's Life defends; and though he owns him thruſt in by the Power of his Father, Count *Albert*, and charges him with Want of Morals and Age, (being but 18 Years old) yet all theſe cannot make him irregular, but that he was St. *Peter*'s Succeſſor, being acknowledged by all the World for *Roman* Pontiff. But the Reaſon of making uſe of this for an Argument they plainly tell in the following Inſtance: Among all that acknowledged *Benedict* IX. for Biſhop of *Rome*, this Author introduces *Herman* Archbiſhop of *Hamburgh*, and *Alebrand* and *Adelbert* his Succeſſors, who took their Palls from *Rome*. But let us take more of this Pope's Character from the foreſaid Author, (*Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 936, 937.) "Pope "*Benedict* (ſays he) being given up to Luxury "and Pleaſures, ran headlong into all Vice, gi-"ving great Scandal to the Faithful by his wicked "Life: But at laſt, either by the Means of *Ptole-*"*my*, the moſt potent Conſul, or the Perſwaſion of "one *Bartholomew* Abbot of the *Crypta Ferrata*, he "quitted the Pontificate. Into his Place gets *Sil-*"*veſter* III. by Bribery and ſuch wicked Practices, "dividing the *Roman* Church by a new Schiſm. "But after Three Months, *Benedict* depoſes this "Intruder, who himſelf is thruſt out by *John* the "Archprieſt of *Rome.*" Here was a Schiſmatical Interruption with a Vengeance, and might not (as

the Author ſays) be improperly compar'd to the Three-headed Monſter come from Hell to infeſt St. *Peter*'s Chair. But ſee the wretched Contrivance of this Author to heal this Schiſm! "A "certain Presbyter of the *Roman* Church, call'd "*Gratian* (afterwards *Gregory* VI.) pitying this ſad "State of the Church, goes to every one of the "Pretenders, (not to buy any Spiritual Dignity, "no not he! but to recover the Peace of the "Church) and with the old Argument, Gold, "perſwades them to quit the Holy See. Thus *Be*"*nedict*, for his Part, having the Revenues of *Eng*"*land* aſſigned him, (no ſmall Portion in thoſe "Days) reſigns, having by Force and Tyranny "for Eleven Years uſurped the Papacy. After his "Example, the reſt, being content with each his "aſſigned Portion, renounce, and the Church is "reſtor'd to her former Union and Concord." Thus giving Money with them is no Bribery, and Bribery no Simony. Therefore they take all Care poſſible in this Pope's Life and in the next to tell us, that *Gratian* did it not to purchaſe any Spiritual Dignity, but to procure the Peace of the Church! Very good! But conſider, that without Money this Peace could not have been procured; nor could that have been done but by ſuch a Man as had Power to raiſe Sums, and ſet apart the Revenues of the Church for thoſe that reſign'd. Theſe Things argue great Power in one Man; and it is not to be queſtion'd but he that did them could as eaſily the ſame Way make himſelf Pope, as change his Name from *Gratian* to that of *Gregory* VI. of whom, more hereafter.

The *Berengarian* Hereſy (as the *Romaniſts* call it) beginning in this Pope's Time, we will take Notice of it here, though it continued diſputable in the Reigns of 13 or 14 ſeveral ſucceeding Popes.

Cabba-

Cabbaſutius, p. 392. is very clamourous, introducing this Story with his uſual Prologue of foul Language, calling *Berengarius* Monſter, Arch-heretick, Viper, *&c.* His Partiality is ſufficient (beſides his Unmannerlineſs) to prejudice any againſt his Account of this Feud, and therefore I ſhall take little Notice of him.

Leutheric Archbiſhop of *Sens* (as has been ſaid) was the Beginner of the Sacramental Controverſy, which *Berengarius* Archdeacon of *Angiers* in a few Years after takes up, and makes his own, for in the Year 1035. he openly denies the CARNAL PRESENCE of Chriſt to be in the Euchariſt; affirming the Body and Blood of our Lord to be preſent ſome Sacramental Way only, or figuratively, drawing *Bruno* Archbiſhop of *Angiers* to his Side. This had been the Opinion of *Bertram*, or *Rathram* in the Ninth Century, who poſitively denied the Tranſubſtantiation of the Euchariſt, affirming the Preſence of Chriſt to be only metaphorically in it. His Treatiſe *de Corpore & Sanguine Domini* makes this plain, and therefore the Champions of the Pontificate endeavour to eclipſe the Reputation of the Author, ſome calling him Heretick and Noveliſt, others ſaying that the Work is corrupt and adulterate, *&c.* As to the firſt, the Morals of the Man, from their own Authors, and his unſpotted Fame, are a ſufficient Vindication, his very Enemies allowing him to be a modeſt, pious, and learned Man. And as to the genuine Authority of the Work, beſides many old Books, the Paſchal Homily of our *Ælfric*, who liv'd in the Tenth Century, is taken almoſt *verbatim* out of this *Bertram*'s Book. To wave the Authority of *John Scotus* and others, the ingenuous Confeſſion of *Mabillonius* is a ſufficient Conviction, who affirms, That an ancient Manuſcript-Book 800 Years old,

in the Monaſtery of *Lobiens*, mentions *Bertram*'s Name in the Beginning and End. *Sæc. Bened.* 4. *par.* 2. *præfat. n.* 83. *Anthony Sanders* likewiſe mentions the ſame Manuſcript, *Biblioth. Belg.* MSS. *Part* 1. *p.* 303. and yet *Bellarmin*, *Genebrard*, *Poſſevin*, *Gregory de Valentia*, and others, would make the World believe, that this very *Bertram* or *Rathram*, in his Book *de Corp & Sang. Domini*, favours the Opinion of the Church of *Rome* about the Euchariſt, though at the ſame Time it differs from it as much as the Eaſt does from the Weſt. *Berengarius* affirms this to have been the Opinion not only of *Bertram* and *Scotus*, but of the Primitive Church, *viz.* That the Bread and Wine were not eſſentially, but figuratively chang'd into the Lord's Body and Blood. Upon this, *Berengarius* is vigorouſly attacked by the Aſſerters of the *Carnal Preſence*: Notwithſtanding which he perſiſts in his Opinion, defending it both with his Tongue and Pen; till Pope *Leo* IX. in the Year 1050. calling a Synod at *Rome*, upon the Reading *Berengarius*'s Epiſtle to *Lanfranc*, (afterwards Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*) he is condemned of Hereſy, and depriv'd of the Communion of the Church; which was likewiſe done the ſame Year in a Council at *Verceil*, in which *Berengarius* appeared by his Two Proctors. About that Time a Convention was held in *Normandy*, in the Preſence of *William the Baſtard*, Duke thereof, where *Berengarius* being likewiſe preſent, his Opinion is argued, but is over-ruled. At *Paris*, though abſent, he is condemned by King *Henry*; and in the Year 1055. he is proceeded againſt in the ſame Manner at *Florence*. The ſame Year Pope *Victor* ſends his Legat *Hildebrand* (afterwards Pope *Gregory* VII.) into *Gaul*, who, calling a Council at *Tourain*, makes *Berengarius* recant. But 1059, in a Synod at *Rome*, being allowed to make his Defence,

he

he ſo well behav'd himſelf, according to *Leo Hoſtienſis Chron. Caſſinenſ. l.* 3. *c.* 33. that no Body could anſwer him. At laſt *Alberic* Deacon of *Caſſinum*, a moſt learned Man, is call'd to the Synod, who, after much Argument, and neither yielding, deſired a Week's Truce, in which Time he wrote a Book againſt *Berengarius*, who being wearied out with ill Treatment, and terrified with Threats, renounces his Opinion in Form. Several Synods to the Year 1078, condemned *Berengarius* and his Adherents; and then, on the Feaſt of *All-Saints*, Pope *Gregory* VII. ſummons a Council, in which *Berengarius* draws up a ſhort Confeſſion of his Faith; and being deſirous to protract Time as long as he could, he obtained Leave till the next Synod, which was in the Year 1079. in which they propos'd a new Confeſſion to him, which he ſubſcrib'd, renouncing and abjuring his former Opinion. That this was an Act of Force, appears plainly from the Conſequence; for it is moſt certain from *Lanfranc*, and others his Cotemporaries, that he returned to his Firſt Opinion. But that which puts it beyond Diſpute is a Manuſcript Treatiſe of *Berengarius*, which *Mabillonius* owns he had read, in which he utterly reſcinds the Third Confeſſion, confuting it by many Arguments; and adding, that he took it through Fear of Death. *After this* (ſays the ſame *Mabillonius*) *he return'd to his Senſes, and to the laſt ſtuck to the Catholick Faith*; but does not prove it by one Inſtance or Argument. Thus *Cabbaſutius* goes on to the End of his Story with great Prejudice, aſſerting more than he proves, to the laſt continuing his foul Language, for which he would certainly have corrected himſelf, had he but look'd into the Author he mentions, *viz. William* of *Malmsbury*, who would have taught him more Manners than to have caſt ſuch vile, dirty

Epithets

Epithets on a Man, whom his Enemies acknowledged to have been famous for Holineſs of Life and good Literature; and undoubtedly *William* of *Malmsbury* (who lived within 100 Years of him) would never have beſtowed ſuch Encomiums on him for his Humility, Charity, Modeſty, Chaſtity, Zeal, Abſtinence, *&c.* if he had not deſerved them: Nor had *Hildebert* Biſhop of *Cenoma* given ſo advantageous a Character, nor ſo highly recommended him to Poſterity in his Epitaph, if he had not deſerved thoſe Eulogies; which may be ſeen at large in *Malmſ. de geſtis Reg. l* 3. *fol.* 63. *Hildebert* lived in the ſame Time with *Berengarius*, and therefore may be allowed to know him better than *Cabbaſutius*, and other modern Authors, who have taken that rude Freedom with him. And ſince *Cabbaſutius* takes the Liberty of mentioning Two ſuch Authors as *William* of *Malmsbury* and *Hildebert*, he ought either to have forborn his own Scurrility, or told the Reader what theſe Two Authors had ſaid in Praiſe of *Berengarius*; but his not telling what they ſay, makes them look like Corroborators of what he ſays. The true Ground of this ſeems to be taken by *Cabbaſutius* from *Baronius*, *ad An.* 1088, whoſe Prejudice to *Hildebert* proceeds from his applauding *Berengarius*, which no *Roman* Paraſite can allow; and whatſoever *Baronius* lays down, the reſt ſeldom fail to follow. Thus under the Pretence of Hereſy, they ſuppreſs Orthodox Truths, and eſtabliſh Hereſy in the Church by Law.

[1044.] *Gregory* VI. whoſe true Name was *Gratian*, for his great Service in procuring Peace to the Church by Bribery, and the Papacy to himſelf by Simony, is by the Editors ſtil'd, *The Deliverer of the Church*; and the Fact is by them call'd *moſt prudent, which*, they ſay, *none but that moſt lying Schiſmatick, Cardinal* Benno, *ever queſtion'd.* Lab. T. 9. p 942.

p. 942. But if they pleaſe to reflect, I think they need no greater Enemies than themſelves, *ibid.* p. 943. " for after Pope *Gregory* VI. was fixed in " the Papacy, he baniſh'd Sacrilegious Invaders " of holy Things, and other wicked Perſons, and " whom he could not by Words and Spiritual " Cenſures, he reſtrain'd by the Spiritual Sword: " For which Cauſe (ſay they) he incurr'd the " Hatred and Ill-will of the *Romans*, who at that " Time liv'd on Rapine and Theft, and who ac- " cuſed him of Simony and Murder to King *Hen-* " *ry*, then at *Placentia*. Therefore calling a Coun- " cil at *Sutri*, in which he preſided, being con- " victed by no Proof, nor judged by any Sentence, " for the Peace of the Church, and to prevent a " Schiſm, which then threaten'd it, in Imitation of " *Gregory Nazianzen*, he quietly reſign'd, after he had " ſate Two Years and Eight Months." A very plauſible Story truly to thoſe that know nothing of the Matter! Let us take it to Pieces, and the Truth will more plainly appear. As to his baniſhing Sacrilegious Perſons, it is very probable, for Two of a Trade ſeldom agree; and conſidering Circumſtances before and afterwards, I do not ſee how he can waſh his Hands clean from that dreadful Sin. As to his uſing the Military Sword in ſuppreſſing Offenders, it was uncanonical in him; but yet a Prognoſtick of a future Uſurpation in the Poſſeſſors of St. *Peter*'s Chair, which too ſoon fell out. They charge him with Simony and Murder; but do not bring him off ſo cleverly as they bring him on; " for, they ſay, being accuſed " of Simony and Murder, he went to King *Henry*, " then at *Placentia*;" and ſo leave him. But immediately they tell us, he call'd a Council, in which he preſided, *&c.* This is the old inconſiſtent, incoherent Story of Pope *Marcellinus*'s trying

ing

ing and judging himself, (*vid. ad An.* 296.) Surely *Gregory*, who laboured so much to obtain the Papacy, would not have quitted it without Compulsion, if he had not seen a Storm approaching, which he could not avoid. *Hermannus* the *Cripple*, a Writer in this Age, and whom the Editors cite, *ibid.* 943, 944. sets the whole Matter in a true Light. "Coming to *Placentia*, (says he, speaking "of King *Henry*) he very honourably received "*Gregory* VI. whom the *Romans* had made Pope. "All Things succeeding happily, about *Christmas* "a Synod was held at *Sutrium* near *Rome*, and the "Case of erroneous Popes being strictly examin'd, "he depriv'd *Gratian*, the Pope convict, of his "Pastoral Staff. Then, by the Consent of all, as "well *Romans* as others, he chose *Suidger* (much "against his Will) chief Bishop of the *Roman* "Church." These are *Hermannus*'s Words, and which carry a quite different Meaning with them than what the Editors intend, if we consider their subsequent Argument. In the first Place, they seem industriously to conceal the Name of the King in this Citation of *Hermannus*, though it is plain from the Context whom he means; for it is certain that *Gregory* VI. fled to King *Henry* at *Placentia*, where he was honourably received. Then a Synod was call'd, by the Pope, say the Editors: *Hermannus* says not by whom; though it is scarcely probable that the Pope call'd this Council at *Sutrium*, because in the Case of erroneous Bishops, which, according to *Hermannus*, seems to be the great Cause of this Council, the Infallibility must of Course be call'd in question; and that it certainly was, for *Gratian* (*i. e. Gregory*) was convicted and depriv'd by *Henry*, who, with the Consent of the *Romans* and others, chose a new Pope. By the Consent of the *Romans* and others, must be

be meant the Will and Pleaſure of King *Henry*, whoſe Eloquence at the Head of an Army, and near *Rome*, no Doubt, was very perſwading. It is worth while to know what was the Meaning of thoſe Words, *the Caſe of erroneous Popes.* This I think the Editors Words immediately following make plain: "What was done in this Synod does "not relate to the Three Schiſmatical depos'd "Biſhops:" (Meaning the Three that *Gregory* VI. had brib'd with Penſions to reſign.) This is begging the Queſtion, and argues a Jealouſy, that the Council of *Sutrium* was call'd to reconcile that Diſorder and Confuſion which theſe Schiſmatical Biſhops had occaſion'd, and eſpecially *Gregory*, who was puniſhed with Deprivation, and therefore conſequently was included in the Number of the *Erroneous* Popes mentioned by *Hermannus.* Whatever the Editors may ſay to colour over theſe Inconſiſtences, they will not paſs with any Man in Oppoſition to the Credit of *Hermannus*, whoſe Reputation far outſhines any of them. Before we leave this Pope, I cannot but take Notice of one Thing, and that is the unjuſt Compariſon of *Gregory* VI. with *Gregory Nazianzen.* If they had carried the *Simile* no farther than the Name, they had done well; but the Circumſtance and Action make them very different; for *Gregory Nazianzen* ſtudiouſly declin'd Epiſcopal Promotion; and after he had been, as it were, by Force confirmed in the Patriarchal Chair, he voluntarily, and without the leaſt Shadow of Compulſion, reſign'd it, and retired to a private Life, which he always affected. But the Caſe of *Gregory* VI. differs in all Points from this; for whereas *Greg. Nazianzen* ſtudiouſly declin'd being a Biſhop, *Gregory* VI. moſt induſtriouſly ſought it, not ſticking at the moſt uncanonical and ſcandalous Means of obtaining it. And as to the

Part of Abdication, the Editors are as much out in the Application of it, as others have been ſince in a Temporal Caſe: For how can he be ſaid to abdicate an Office, who, being a Delinquent both before and after he was in it, is ſummon'd to a Judicial Trial, where he is convicted, and receives Sentence, which is accordingly executed, and he ſubmits to it. There is a vaſt Difference between a judicial Proceeding againſt a Criminal in his Conviction and Puniſhment, and an innocent Perſon, that declines Promotion, or voluntarily reſigns his Honours, that he may retire nearer to God and his Studies.

[1046.] *Suidger* being choſen Pope by the Intereſt and Power of *Henry*, is ſoon conſecrated, and takes upon him the Name of *Clement* II. Which is no ſooner over, than remembring his Benefactor and Maker, he honours, as the Editors call it, *Henry* and *Agnes* his Wife with the Imperial Benediction. Conſidering Circumſtances, he could do no leſs; for *Henry* made him Pope, and the Pope made him Emperor. Upon the Death of *Clement* II. *Benedict* IX. who had before reſign'd, invades the Apoſtolick See, which he poſſeſſes for Eight Months, till

[1048.] *Damaſus* II. was preſented by the Emperor to it. *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 946. Notwithſtanding they ſay, *Damaſus* was ſent to *Rome*, elected, and conſecrated there; yet the Right of Preſentation, which they ſay the Emperor aſſum'd, and actually executed in this and the laſt Pope's Preſentation to the Holy See, looks as if the Chair of St. *Peter* had quitted or reſign'd that Right to the Secular Power. Or elſe, conſidering the Services done, and the Intereſts eſpous'd by ſeveral Popes after their Conſecration, it looks too much like Simony, and that they perform'd the End for which they

were promoted by the Secular Power. *Damaſus* ſat but three and twenty Days, in which Time they date a Council, but they do not ſay called by the Pope, only in the Title, "The Council "of *Sens*, held by all the Biſhops of the Province "in the Preſence of *Henry* King of the *Franks*, "*A. D.* 1048." By this it is plain the Council was called by the King, nor was the Pope in the leaſt concern'd in it, for *Guilduin* Archbiſhop of *Sens* preſided in it. Beſides, in the Account the Editors give of this Council, they tell us, that the King and Biſhops (not naming the Pope) confirm'd the Foundation of the Monaſtery of St. *Aygulf*, in the City of *Pruim*, built by *Theobald*.

[1049.] Upon the Death of *Damaſus* II. *Benedict* IX. who had been brib'd to reſign, renews his Claim, but is thrown aſide by *Leo* IX.'s Means, on this Occaſion: "*Benedict* having forcibly a "Third Time invaded the Apoſtolick See, the "Cardinals petition the Emperor *Henry* II. to "eject him. Hereupon the Emperor forthwith "elects *Bruno*, (who afterwards called himſelf "*Leo* IX.) and robeing him with the Pontifical "Purple, diſmiſſes him, that he might go and pre-"ſent himſelf before the Cardinals to be elected "by them." Theſe are the Words of the Editors. *Labb. T.* 9. *p.* 947. But this Story requires a little Animadverſion. As to the Invaſion of the Holy See by *Benedict*, the Editors do not much trouble themſelves; but the other Part of the Story, which relates to the Manner of Pope *Leo*'s Election by the Emperor, they think requires a little Dreſſing and Modifying, for it claſhes with the Supremacy, and gives too great a Conceſſion and Power to the Temporal Prince, till the Biſhop of *Rome* himſelf is made one. And therefore to colour this over with ſome Authority, they produce *Otho* Biſhop

of

of *Freising*, (a zealous Bigot and Admirer of the Papacy) who gives the foresaid Story a pleasant Turn. " As *Leo* went thro' *Gaul*, says he, it hap-
" pen'd that he came to *Clugny*, where *Hildebrand*
" was Prior, who no sooner sees him, but charges
" him to desist from his Undertaking, affirming it
" to be unlawful for a Pope to receive the Go-
" vernment of the whole Church from a Lay-
" Hand; and that if he would be advis'd by
" him, he would prevent the Imperial Censure,
" and preserve the Liberty of the Church, by re-
" newing the Election. *Leo* consents to this, and
" divesting himself of the Purple, travels in the
" Habit of a Pilgrim, taking *Hildebrand* with him;
" and when they came to *Rome*, he is by the
" Counsel of *Hildebrand* chosen Pope by the Cler-
" gy and People." So far *Otho*. And thus, say the Editors, *Leo*, in an Apostolick Manner, as it had been revealed to him Five Years by Prophecies and Visions, was lawfully chosen Bishop of *Rome*, *Lab. ib. p.* 947. But notwithstanding all this Varnish, these two Stories, which they would fain make to agree by explaining one by the other, do very much differ in Probability and Fact. For if, as the Editors say, *ibid.* after *Bruno* was elected by the Emperor, that he presented himself to the Assembly of Cardinals, to be elected by them, it looks like the Emperor's recommending, and the Cardinals electing or confirming; then there would have been no Occasion for *Bruno*'s divesting himself of the Purple, and coming to a Re-Election. But if we take these two Stories in Opposition to each other, they plainly contradict one another; for the one says, he presented himself before the Cardinals to be elected, which implies their Acceptation or Confirmation of the Emperor's Choice:

The

The other, that he diveſted himſelf of the Purple, at the Inſtigation of *Hildebrand*, and reſum'd the Pontificate by a due Election of the Clergy and People; ſo that one of theſe muſt be falſe. But to come to the Truth of this Story, it is plain, that the Editors introduce *Otho* of *Freiſing*'s Story for no other End, than to confirm the Power of Inveſtitures in the Pope, and the Elections of Popes in the College of Cardinals, which the Pontificate in this Century ſeiz'd, and none ſo fit to be thought the Inſtrument in this as *Hildebrand*, (afterwards Pope by the Name of *Gregory* VII.) who ſet his Infallibility right, perſuading him to depoſe himſelf, and be *lawfully elected Biſhop of the* Roman *Church*. *Lab. ibid.* But of this, more when we come to that Pope's Life. The Editors would ſeem to excuſe the Story of this Pope's marching at the Head of an Army, and fighting the *Normans*, who routed his Army, and took his Holineſs Priſoner, by condemning *Peter Damiani*, who wrote an Epiſtle to *Firminus*, a Biſhop, againſt Pope *Leo*'s waging War, reprehending him for Irregularity; and undoubtedly he was guilty of it, as many Canons both of the *Greek* and *Latin* Churches poſitively affirm. "But, ſay they, ſince the univerſal Church think "otherwiſe, it is pardonable in a melancholy "Monk to take ſuch Freedom with the *German* and "*Gallick* Biſhops who went armed Cap-a-pe: "*Germanorum & Gallorum loricatos & galeatos Epiſcopos perſtringens*. *Lab. ib. p.* 948.

As to the Epiſtles of this Pope, I dare ſay, they are genuine, the greateſt Part of them being Aſſertions of the Papal Power, aſſuming a Right of Pre-eminency over all the World: Of which the Third and Fourth are very remarkable Inſtances. *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 972, 973, 974. The Third to *Thomas*, an *African* Biſhop, ſeems to aſſert the Primacy

of the Archbiſhop of *Carthage*; and that one *Gummitanus*, another *African* Biſhop, ought not to pretend to conſecrate Biſhops, or call a Provincial Council, without the Primate's Conſent: But cloſes all with the old Topick, *viz.* That it is ſolely in the Biſhop of *Rome* to depoſe Biſhops, and to call General Councils. This is likewiſe the Burden of the Fourth; but if *Aurelius* Biſhop of *Carthage* had been alive with his Suffragans in Council, the Biſhop of *Rome* would have found the 42d Canon of the Council of *Carthage*, *A. D.* 419. which Pope *Leo* applies only to *Afric*, to have extended every where; and that it was deſign'd as a Check upon all Exorbitants who ſhould act out of their own Sphere. But it is too plain, that the *African* Church was brought to a low Ebb, when the Biſhop of *Rome* ſhould thus peremptorily dictate to her; for as this Pope ſays in the Beginning of the Third Epiſtle, from Two hundred and five Biſhops that ſat in Council, there were then not above Five in all *Afric*. This Conceſſion would never have been, but at ſuch a Time as the Biſhops of the *African* Church were reduc'd, and the exorbitant Power of the Church of *Rome* exalted.

But concerning the Election and Conſecration of this Pope, the Editors, out of the Old Book of *Rhemes* publiſh'd by *Baronius*, ſpeak more plainly than any hitherto. *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 1028. "Pope "*Damaſus* being dead, the *Romans* ſend an Embaſſy "to *Henry* the Emperor, deſiring that the vacant "Church might be ſupplied with a Paſtor. The "Emperor hereupon conſulting the Biſhops and "Nobility of the Empire, found none ſo fit for "the Office as *Bruno* Biſhop of *Toul*, being of a "due Age, good Life, and near a-kin to him. "And accordingly the Enſigns of the Apoſtolick "Dignity are order'd him, with a Command from "the

" the Emperor that he forthwith repair to *Rome*, " according to the Canons of the Church." Here is a plain and positive Narration of the whole Matter in little, *viz.* That *Bruno* was the Emperor's Kinsman, and he made him Pope. No Election at *Rome*, or Confirmation of what the Emperor had done; but the Emperor made him Pope, and upon that Foot he reign'd as such. Here was no deposing himself, in order to proceed to a new and lawful Election, but a direct Pursuance of his Journey to *Rome*, to take Possession of his new Honour and Charge.

In the Year 1049, this Pope calls a Council at *Rhemes*, at which he himself was present; where, at the Request of the Council, several ancient Decrees relating to Ecclesiastick Discipline are reviv'd; the first of which looks like a Reproach upon this Pope's Accession to the Chair; for it forbids any Ecclesiastick Promotion without the Election of the Clergy and People.

[1055.] There is very little said by the Editors in the Life of Pope *Victor*, besides the pretended Miracle, by which they tell us out of *Lambert* that he escap'd Poisoning, so ridiculous in it self, that it will not bear relating. He is succeeded by

[1057.] *Stephen* IX. who was so unwillingly chosen Pope, that by Force they drew him from his Retirement to St. *Peter*'s, and consecrated him. How unwilling soever this *Frederick* (for such was his Name) might be to accept the Pontificate, let who will judge; but his antecedent Qualifications, especially in Opposition to any Thing that interfer'd with the Power of the *Roman* Pontiff, were such as would indisputably at that Time recommend him to the Possession of St. *Peter*'s Chair, if the Interest of the Clergy and People of *Rome* could prevail; for he and *Humbert* being sent Le-

gates from *Leo* IX. in the Year 1054, to *Conſtantinople*, they depoſed *Michael* the Patriarch, and excommunicated him. Returning into *Italy*, for ſiding too much with his Brother *Godfry* Duke of *Lorrain*, he ſo far incurs the Diſpleaſure of the Emperor *Henry*, as to be confin'd to the Monaſtery of *Caſſino*, where he is oblig'd to diveſt himſelf of all his Honours, and take upon him the Habit of the Order; where, in the Year 1057, by the Power and Intereſt of Pope *Victor* II. he is made Abbot, and ſoon after declar'd Cardinal, and, the Pope dying, he is elected Pope by the Name of *Stephen* IX. The moſt remarkable Part of his Life, is the Deſign he had of depoſing *Henry* the Emperor, and transferring the Empire to his Brother the Duke of *Lorrain*; which, that he might the more eaſily bring to paſs, he calls a Synod at *Rome*, wherein he declares the Emperor a Heretick, for aſſuming the Inveſtitures of Biſhops, which he claim'd as his Due, at the ſame Time ſending *Hildebrand* into *Germany* to proclaim the ſame. *Papebroch. Conat. ad Catalog. Pontiff. Par.* 1. *p.* 192. Thus private Intereſt and Ambition blew the Coals of this fatal Quarrel, and no fitter an Incendiary to carry it on than *Hildebrand*, of whom more hereafter. This *Roman* Council, nor any other in this Pope's Time, is not mentioned by the Editors, but whether thro' Neglect or Deſign, I ſhall not affirm: But I am apt to think they did not look upon it as an Addition to the Reputation of Pope *Stephen*, and ſo might omit it. The Decree of this *Stephen* IX. about the future Election of a Pope, argued the mighty Influence of *Hildebrand*, as well as his growing Greatneſs in the Court of *Rome*. This Decree, according to the Words of *Leo Oſtienſis*, notwithſtanding *Hildebrand*'s Power, was not obtained without ſome Reluctancy. "If Pope *Stephen*, ſays he,

"ſhould

" ſhould die, before *Hildebrand*, Subdeacon of the " Church of *Rome*, ſhould return from the Em- " preſs, to whom he was ſent on an Embaſſy up- " on the publick Account, that no Body ſhould " preſume to elect a Pope, but that the Apoſtolick " See ſhould be vacant till his Return, to be diſ- " poſed of by his Advice." Which was accordingly done, tho' not without ſome Interruption: For the Death of Pope *Stephen* being known, a Number of Seditious by Force make *Mincius* Biſhop of *Veletri* Pope, by the Name of *Benedict* X. Upon this the Cardinals fled from the City of *Florence*, where Pope *Stephen* dy'd, and in their Flight they choſe *Gerard* Pope, by the Name of

[1058.] *Nicolas* II. " But before they conſecrated " him, or let him go to *Rome*, by the Advice of *Hil-* " *debrand*, they (ſtrictly obſerving Pope *Stephen*'s " Decree) diſpatch a Legate to the Empreſs, to " procure the Emperor's Conſent and Approba- " tion, and to eject the Schiſmatick Pope; fearing " that upon Neglect hereof the Emperor ſhould " think himſelf affronted, and take Part with the " Schiſmaticks, which might encreaſe the Danger " of the Schiſm. This Advice of *Hildebrand's* " pleas'd, and the Approbation of the Emperor is " no ſooner ask'd than obtain'd." *Lab. T. 9. p.* 1090. As yet we ſee the Biſhops of *Rome* could not carry their Point in the Caſe of electing a Pope, nothing being yet to be done in that Caſe without the Conſent of the Emperor. And though this Pope goes as far as he durſt, by a Decree, *ibid. p.* 1103, 1104. impowering the Cardinals, *Electum Epiſcopum ad Apoſtolici Culminis Apicem provehant*, to inthrone the elected Biſhop; yet, in the next Paragraph, it is done with this Precaution, *Salvo debito Honore & Reverentia dilecti noſtri Filii Henrici, &c.* In the ſame

manner they proceed in the Election of *Anſelm*, whom they choſe by the Name of

[1061.] *Alexander* II. after an Interregnum of three Months. For when the Death of Pope *Nicolas* was known, the Nobility and People of *Rome* aſſembling together, ſent to the Emperor *Henry* for Leave to chooſe a Biſhop of *Rome*; which, when the Cardinals underſtood, they did the ſame; but, ſay they, againſt the Law of Nations, they were not admitted. *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 1112. However, that they might but ſeem to carry their Point, rather than be wholly laid aſide, they reſolve upon a very plauſible Expedient to ſupport their Power of Election, and pleaſe the Emperor too; for they choſe (though they did not like the Man) *Anſelm* Pope, by Country a *Milaneſe*, and Biſhop of *Luca*, but a particular Favourite of the Emperor and his Court. But this being carried on without the Emperor's Knowledge or Conſent, every one complains of the Wrong done to the Emperor; and, by the Advice of *Guibert* of *Parma*, they choſe *Cadalous* Biſhop of *Parma* Pope, who had for ſome Time been excommunicated by Pope *Nicolas*. But this Affair being argued between the Emperor and *Roman* Church's Advocates, *Cadalous* is by a general Conſent condemn'd, and *Alexander*'s Election confirm'd. *Lab. T.* 9. *p.* 1156, *&c.*

The Council of *Mantua*, *A. D.* 1064, looks like a forc'd Acknowledgment of the Editors, to which they give the uſual Dreſs. *ib. p.* 1179. "When "*Cadalous*, ſay they, was condemn'd at *Rome*, thoſe "of his Party gave Pope *Alexander* continual "Trouble, objecting, that he obtained the Papacy "by Bribery. Then, at the Requeſt of *Anno* "Archbiſhop of *Colen*, he call'd a Council at *Man-*"*tua*, in which he (tho' it was below his Digni-"ty) made his Election appear to be lawful and "juſt."

" juſt." From hence it is plain, that a Biſhop of *Rome* at this Time was liable to the Cenſure of a Council, notwithſtanding what the Editors ſay of his Juſtification being below his Dignity. It is certain he was in a ſynodical Way called to Account for Bribery, and oblig'd to purge himſelf by Oath. *ib. p.* 1180. And here I cannnot omit *Binius*'s Blunder, who firſt affirms *Cadalous* the Pſeudopope to be preſent at this Council by Order of *Anno* Archbiſhop of *Colen*, and then immediately after, in the Words of *Arragonius*, which he ſubjoins, ſays, " That being touch'd with Remorſe of Conſcience, he did not appear. *ibid.*

[1073.] We are come now to the Reign of thundering Pope *Gregory* VII. before called *Hildebrand.* He was a *Tuſcan* by Nation, and of mean Parentage, his Father being a Smith by Trade. Whilſt he was but a Lad in his Father's Shop, and igorant of Letters, he by meer Accident fram'd theſe Words out of little Bits of Wood: *His Dominion ſhall be from one Sea to the other.* This is told of him by *Brietius*, *ad An.* 1073. as a Prognoſtick of his future Greatneſs; but the flattering Jeſuit had made the Story more *a propos* to the Circumſtances of the Perſon, if he had ſaid, that *Hildebrand* had thus accidentally framed theſe Words out of Bits of Iron, becauſe it was done in his Father's Shop, who was a Smith, and conſequently wrought in Iron, not Wood. He was without Doubt a Youth of quick Parts, and a very aſpiring Genius, as will appear by the Sequel of his Life. He received his *Education* from *Laurence* Archbiſhop of *Amalfi*, notorious for his Skill in Magick, and *Gregory* VI. who laboured under the ſame ſcandalous Imputation; by whom he was afterwards made Subdeacon of the Church of *Rome.* In the Year 1047, he follow'd his depoſed Maſter *Grego-*

ry VI. into *Germany*, from whence going into *France*, he took up in the Monaſtery of *Cluni*, where in a ſhort Time he was made Prior. I ſhall wave the many and great Employments he obtain'd and enjoy'd in the ſeveral Pontificates he lived under, till he was inveſted with the Sacred Purple. In the Year 1073, on the 30th of *June*, he was conſecrated, tho' for Twenty Years before he may be ſaid to have ſat at the Helm of the Holy See, acting as arrogantly as any Pope; for all Things were manag'd by his Order and Direction. In ſhort, he was a Man of a fierce and haughty Spirit, govern'd by nothing but Pride and Ambition, the Fury and Scourge of the Age he lived in, and the moſt inſolent Tyrant of the Chriſtian World; that could dream of nothing leſs than the promoting St. *Peter*'s Regale by the Addition of Scepters and Diadems. And in this Regard he may be ſaid to be the firſt *Roman* Pontiff that ever made an Attempt upon the Rights of Kings and Princes. Hence proceeded thoſe thundering Anathema's, thoſe direful Curſes, that were ſhower'd on the Heads of Emperors and Kings. Hence thoſe many Barbarities, Slaughters, Poiſons, unnatural Parricides, and other horrible and flagitious Practices, as the Age they were committed in could not ſufficiently deplore, nor the preſent Time reflect upon without Horror and Amazement. But theſe we will take according to the Series of Time they were tranſacted in, or as we occaſionally meet with them.

After a ſhort Hiſtorical Account of the former Part of this Pope's Life, and a Miracle or two, the Editors ſeem concern'd to take off the Imputation of an undue Election of him, objected againſt him eſpecially by Cardinal *Benno* and *Conrade* Abbot of *Urſpergh*, who charge him directly

with Simony. And then, to confirm *Gregory* VI. in the Catalogue of Popes, (who is not allow'd by all) they tell us, that *Hildebrand* took upon him the Name of *Gregory* VII. purely out of Gratitude and Reſpect to his Patron and Preceptor *Gregory* VI. calling himſelf *Gregory* VII. which implies a *Gregory* VI. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1, 2, 3, *&c.*

A. D. 1073. he begins with *Philip* King of *France.* whom he threatens with Excommunication, and the Loſs of his Kingdom, for Simony and other Crimes. And the Year following he writes to the Biſhops, commanding them, if the King would not obey, to reſiſt him, and to put the whole Kingdom under Interdiction; and if he ſhould perſiſt, to deprive him. Excellent Advice to Subjects againſt their Prince! *Ibid. p.* 72. There are ſeveral Epiſtles of this Strain in the like Caſe againſt the Emperor *Henry* IV. His Firſt Epiſtle, *l.* 4. *To all Chriſtians,* charges his Subjects to reſiſt him. His Second, to *Herimannus* Biſhop of *Metz,* ſets the Pontificate above the *Regale.* And the Third, to the *Germans,* obliges them to chooſe another in the Room of *Henry* IV. unleſs he remov'd his evil Councellors from him, and repented. *Ibid. p.* 147, 149, 151. All theſe are only to confirm the Uſurpation of the Pontificate, in laying Claim to and diſpoſing of all Crowns, whoſe Owners will not go their Lengths. According to this Scheme, this Pope in his Firſt Year writes to the Princes of *Spain,* ſignifying his Leave to Count *Evulus* to poſſeſs that Part of *Spain* which he had taken from the *Saracens.* But it is ſcarcely credible, that that Man, who had the Bravery to purchaſe with his Sword any Country from an Enemy, would ask the Pope's Leave to poſſeſs or enjoy what he had thus manfully obtain'd, and eſpecially from heatheniſh Invaders. But whether this Leave

were

were ask'd, or given unask'd, (no Matter which) here is an Epiſtle for a Precedent, to ſhew what the Biſhop of *Rome* could do at a Diſtance; and therefore we are not to wonder, that he could prevail ſo much in *Italy*, as to make *Richard* Prince of *Capua*, *A. D.* 1073, take a formal Oath of Allegiance to him in theſe Words: "I *Richard*, by the "Grace of God and St. *Peter*, Prince of *Capua*, "from this Hour and henceforward will be faith-"ful to the Holy Church of *Rome* and the Apo-"ſtolick See, and to my Lord *Gregory*, Univerſal "Biſhop, *&c.*" *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 23. The next Inſtance of this Kind is in the Year following; when Pope *Gregory* writes to *Solomon* King of *Hungary*, whom he reprimands ſeverely for acknowledging his Kingdom as a Fife of the Empire, which he challenges as a Property of the *Roman* Church, and a peculiar Right of St. *Peter*; aſſuring him withal, that unleſs he retracted his Error, and own'd himſelf a Feudal of the Eccleſiaſtick, not Imperial, Majeſty, he ſhould not long enjoy it. *Ibid.* 81. The ſame Year likewiſe he attacks *Robert Guiſcard* Duke of *Apulia* and *Calabria*, whom he chaſtiſes with an armed Force, and compels to make Reparations for Injuries done to St. *Peter's Regale*.

This Year likewiſe there were ſeveral Synods call'd in *Italy* about the married Clergy; whoſe Marriage, notwithſtanding God had pleas'd to call a Holy Ordinance, they profanely call Concubinage, and forbid it the Clergy, calling that Incontinency which St. *Paul* preſcribes as a Remedy againſt it. This Decree of Pope *Gregory* VII.'s is ſent to the Council of *Erfurdt* in *Duringen* in *Saxony*, where it is no ſooner promulg'd, but the Clergy ſet themſelves moſt furiouſly in Oppoſition to it, as *Lambert Schaffnaberg*, *Chron. p.* 506. handſomly expreſſes

preſſes in theſe Words: "The whole Clergy ſtre-
" nuouſly oppoſe this Decree, calling *Gregory* VII.
" downright Heretick and Madman, who had for-
" gotten the Words of the Apoſtle, *He that cannot*
" *contain himſelf, let him marry; for it is better to mar-*
" *ry than to burn*; who by a violent Exaction de-
" manded from Men cloathed with Fleſh and
" Blood to live the Life of Angels; and yet whilſt
" he thus pretended to deny Nature her lawful Li-
" berty, encouraged Fornication and Uncleanneſs: But if he perſiſted in the Proſecution of
" this Sentence, they were reſolved to quit the
" Prieſthood rather than diſſolve their Marriage-
" Vows; and then he might ſee what Angels he
" could get to govern the Church." When the Archbiſhop of *Mentz* found that he could prevail neither with Perſwaſions nor Threatnings, he diſſolved the Synod, after having declared the Pope's Decree. This Pope's proceeding with ſuch Vehemence againſt the married Clergy, and calling their Marriage Concubinage, argues a moſt hard and impenetrable Front; for at the ſame Time there were not only ſtrong Preſumptions and Suſpicions of his Incontinency with *Mathilda*, but he was likewiſe accuſed of it; which the Editors tell us was charged upon him, but they do not clear him of it, only at Random, as in the like Caſes they aſſert, but do not prove, ſo here they call it Malice, and leave it.

In *October*, *A. D.* 1075, *Sigefrid* Archbiſhop of *Mentz* calls a Council there, at which was the Biſhop of *Curia*, who was commiſſion'd by the Pope, upon Pain of Degradation and Loſs of his Orders, to compel all the Presbyters of his Dioceſe forthwith to renounce their Wives, or quit their Office: Which whilſt he was labouring to bring about, the Clergy ſo unanimouſly with Tongue and Hand be-

labour'd

labour'd and attack'd him, that he had much to do to eſcape with Life. Wherefore frighted with the Difficulty of the Enterprize, and not daring to proceed in it, he left the Execution of the Sentence to his Holineſs. *Lambert*, *Schaffn.* *p.* 515.

About the End of this Year the Feud began to grow high between the Pope and the Emperor. The Pope writes a chiding Letter to the Emperor for communicating with Excommunicates; wonders that in his Letters and Embaſſies he ſhould profeſs himſelf ſo devoted to the Intereſt of the Church, and at the ſame Time act againſt it, and refuſe Obedience to his Decrees. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 137. But a little after, *ib. p.* 147. he forbids all Communion with the Emperor; and *p.* 149. in a Letter to him, he excommunicates all, Biſhops and Laicks, who communicate with him; aſſerts the Rights of excommunicating Kings by the Authority and Example of Holy Popes, and pretends to demonſtrate, that the Biſhops of *Rome* are above crown'd Heads; ſtill promiſing Abſolution if he would return; inviting him to *Rome* to purge and reconcile himſelf: Which the Emperor refuſing, the Pope perſwades the *Saxons* to rebel; as did alſo ſeveral Princes and Biſhops of *Germany*; which the Emperor hearing, and that they were about to meet at *Tribur* to chooſe an Emperor, he was reconcil'd to the Pope, coming in Perſon to *Rome* to receive Abſolution. But returning to *Germany*, at the Inſtigation of Schiſmaticks, and the Favourers of Concubinage, (for that's the beſt Term they can give to Marriage) he relaps'd. Thus the Editors, *T.* 10. *p.* 5. who notwithſtanding they do upon all Occaſions ſet the Mitre above the Crown; yet in the very following Words in the foremention'd Page, they ſeem unwilling to ſet the Pope at the Head of ſo baſe an Action as the depoſing of

Henry,

Henry, and placing *Rodolph* of *Sweden* in his Room; but ſay, That the Emperor and *Guibert*, with certain other Rebels, (for with them Princes may be Rebels to their Subjects) having contriv'd a moſt foul Conſpiracy againſt the Pope, the Princes of *Germany*, without conſulting Pope *Gregory*, choſe *Rodolph*; which is abſolutely falſe, as will appear in the Sequel of this Story from the Editors themſelves.

The Quarrel running ſo high between the Emperor and Pope, that nothing but Depoſition will ſatisfy the Contenders, the Emperor calls a Council at *Wormes*, *A. D.* 1076. The Account of which we will take from the Editors in *Lambert Schaffnaberg*'s own Words. " The Emperor being very " much enrag'd at the Pope's Letter, (*T.* 10. *p.* 137.) " ſends back the Legates with the utmoſt Con- " tempt, and commands all the Biſhops and Ab- " bots throughout his Kingdom to meet him at " *Wormes*, there to conſult about depoſing the Bi- " ſhop of *Rome*, upon which he knew his own " Safety and the Eſtabliſhment of his Kingdom " depended. The King and the Clergy met at " the Time appointed; when, to put a helping " Hand to this great Affair, there came likewiſe " one *Hugh*, a Cardinal of the Church of *Rome*, " Sirnamed *Blancus*, whom the Pope a few Days " before had depoſed for certain Follies and Im- " moralities. This Perſon contributed much to " the facilitating the Matter; for by a certain De- " ſign, in the Nature of a Tragedy, he ſets forth " his Original, Youth, Manhood, irregular Ad- " vancement to the Apoſtolick See, and ſeveral " other notorious Practices. In ſhort, Letters are " ſent in the Name of all the Biſhops and Abbots " to the Biſhop of *Rome*, wherein he is order'd to " quit the Apoſtolick See, which he had unlawful-

" ly

" ly uſurp'd; and to know, that after that Day, " whatever he ſhould pretend to do as Biſhop of " *Rome*, would be look'd on as invalid." The Pope, to be quit with the Emperor, in a Synod at *Rome* the ſame Year excommunicates him, and ſeveral Biſhops of his Party, citing the reſt to appear at *Rome*. The Emperor hereupon retorts the *Anathema* of the *Roman* Synod. Thus they continued piqueering at each other till the Year 1079, or 1080, when in a *Roman* Synod the Empire, as forfeited by *Henry*, was transferr'd to *Rodolph* of *Sweden*; on this Condition, that no Lay-perſon whatever ſhould hereafter pretend to the Inveſtitures of Benefices; ſending him at the ſame Time a Crown of Gold, with this Verſe inſcrib'd:

Petra dedit Petro, Petrus Diadema Rodulpho.

Thus the Inveſtitures followed the Fate of Crowns; nor were they likely to continue free, when the rightful Diſpoſers of them were ſubjected. In this Council, there were Two ſevere Decrees made to ſecure the Right of Inveſtitures in the Church. The Firſt, threatening Depoſition and Excommunication to any Perſon that ſhould accept of a Biſhoprick or Abbey from a Lay-perſon. The Second, that if any Emperor, King, or other Secular Perſon, ſhould pretend to take upon him the Inveſtiture of a Biſhoprick, or any Eccleſiaſtick Dignity, he ſhould be liable to the ſame Sentence. Thus Pope *Gregory* riveted the Point he had ſo long aim'd at, and which he left ſo ſecure to his Succeſſors, that to this Day it remains firm and entire, except in thoſe Countries which have ſhaken off the *Roman* Yoke.

The ſame Year a Council begun at *Mentz*, and ended at *Breſcia* in *Lombardy*, wherein *Gregory* is depos'd,

pos'd, and *Guibert* Archbiſhop of *Ravenna* put in his Room. The Concluſion of this Synod's Decree is very ſharp, than which nothing can be more ſarcatical, or render a humane Creature more monſtrous. After they had paſs'd Sentence, they give theſe Reaſons, according to *Conrad. Urſpergenſ. in Chron. ad An.* 1080. *p.* 171. "Becauſe (ſay they) "it's plain he is not choſen of God, but of him-"ſelf, by the Corruption and Power of Money: "One who has ſubverted Eccleſiaſtick Order, and "diſturbed the Peace of the Chriſtian World, and "hath plotted Ruin of Body and Soul to a Catho-"lick peaceable King: A Defender of perjured "Princes: A Sower of Diſcord among quiet Peo-"ple, of Scandal among the Brethren, and a Se-"parator of Man and Wife. Calling him beſides, "Preſumptuous, Sacrilegious, Incendiary, Perjur'd, "a Friend of Murtherers, Necromancer, falſe Pro-"phet, *&c.*" But they will ſay, perhaps, this comes from an Enemy and a Schiſmatick, as they call *Conrad Urſperg.* But though it does, and that *Conrad* takes it from Cardinal *Benno*, another that was no Friend of the Pontificate; yet let them conſider, that *Benno* lived in thoſe Times, and was the better able to give the Truth of the Circumſtances and Characters of Men than more modern Authors, and at a greater Diſtance of Time. Nor do I think the Decree at *Brixen* in *Germany* comes ſhort of *Conrad*, which calls him "Deſerting Monk, "Corrupter of the holy Philoſophy with new "Opinions, a Diſturber of the Peace; that con-"founds together Things Sacred and Profane, Di-"vine and Humane, both which he equally adul-"terates: One that is Accuſer, Witneſs, and Judge, "at the ſame Time; parting Man and Wife, and "preferring Fornication, Adultery, and Inceſt, to "lawful Wedlock: Calling him beſides, Falſe

"Monk,

" Monk, Magician, Quack in Divinity, Whim-
" ſical Dreamer, wavering in the Chriſtian Reli-
" gion, *&c.*" as may be ſeen in the *Senat. Conſult. apud Annal. Boair, l. 5. p.* 569, *&* 579.

In the Twelfth *Roman* Council, which was in the Year 1074, Pope *Gregory* VII. ſhews the End for which the Decretal Epiſtles of former Popes were forg'd. Pope *Marcellus*, as has been ſaid *ad An.* 304. was ſo obſcure, that neither *Euſebius* or *Theodorit* knew any Thing of him. And it is too plain that there was no ſuch Perſon, his Name being only thruſt into the Catalogue of Popes to fill up a Vacancy, ; and conſequently all Epiſtles and Decrees aſcrib'd to him muſt be fictitious. Yet becauſe theſe Decretal Epiſtles make for the Supremacy, as may be ſeen in the Hints on this Pope's Life at the Year aforeſaid, and though *Bellarmine* and others are ſo far from aſſerting them to be genuine, that they will not affirm them to be ſuch, yet the Editors are not aſhamed to ſet Pope *Gregory* VII. (though their moſt early Darling) in the Front of moſt notorious Forgeries and Lies. In the Third Chapter of this Council, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 317. ſpeaking of the Obſervation of *Roman* Pontiffs Decrees, as being of more Authority than the Four Firſt General Councils, and that thoſe Councils had been invalid without the Sanction of the Apoſtolick See, they bring in Pope *Marcellus* (who never was) to confirm this ; ſaying, " This Bleſ-
" ſed Pope, who before the *Nicene* Council ſign'd
" his Decrees with Martyrdom, in the Eleventh
" Chapter ſays, The Apoſtles themſelves, and
" their Succeſſors, by the Inſpiration of the Lord,
" decreed, That there ſhould be no Synod with-
" out the Authority of the See of *Rome.*" This is the very laſt Degree of Impudence and Profaneneſs ; for it is moſt certain, that there is no Part of

the New Teſtament that mentions any Thing of this Nature. But, I ſuppoſe, this is foiſted in with Deſign to countenance the following Chain of Untruths in this Chapter; for, in the firſt Place, he that believes this *Marcellus* to have been Pope, will believe all is father'd on him, tho' to the perverting, by Addition or Diminution, any Text of Scripture; (for whoever ſits in St. *Peter*'s Chair cannot err, though he turn Heretick or Heathen) and then all Stories or Forgeries of leſs Note go down without Scruple. A plain Conſequence of which we have in the ſame Chapter, *ibid p.* 317. "St. *Athana-*
"*ſius*, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, who made no mean
"Figure in the Council of *Nice*, in his Epiſtle to
"Pope *Felix*, ſays thus: We know that it was de-
"termined in the great Council of *Nice*, That no
"Councils ought to be held without the Conſent
"of the Biſhop of *Rome*." This is not the firſt Falſity impoſed upon *Athanaſius*, as has been ſhewn in the Papacy of Pope *Mark*, *ad An.* 336. Beſides, it is falſe in another Part, for we have already ſhewn ſeveral Councils called and held without the Pope's Knowledge and Conſent, and never ſent to him to be confirm'd. This Chapter goes on to prove by their own Popes, that no Council ought to be held without their Leave, ſaying, *That Canonical Authority, Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, and the Holy Fathers, all agree in this*; till it comes to the Preſident of the Firſt *Nicene* Council, in which they will have *Hoſius* and two Presbyters to be the Pope's Legates, and preſide. But this we have already cleared in the Papacy of *Silveſter*, *ad An.* 314. And as for the Confirmation of this Council, this Chapter differs very much from the Preface or Hiſtory of the Council of *Nice*, (as they call it.) *Lab. T.* 11. *p.* 6, & 67.

This Chapter ſays, That the Three Legates aforeſaid confirm'd it by their Subſcription; and the

Preface and Notes say, that this Council writ a Letter to *Silvester* for his Confirmation, and that he called a Council at *Rome*, and writ back, to ratify what they had done. But these Epistles are most infamous Forgeries, as appear plainly by the Barbarity of the Style, and Intricacy of the Sense. *Lab. ib. p.* 68. *Bin. p.* 348. *col.* 1. Besides, in the Margin aforesaid, *Labbé* tells us they are Fictions, and *Baronius* will not affirm them to be genuine, *An.* 325. *n.* 37. And tho' *Binius* in his Notes, *p.* 348. *col.* 1. *in Marg.* cites them for Evidence; yet, *p.* 365. *col.* 1. *Not. ad. Concil. Rom.* tells us, *It is evident they are both corrupted*; and again he says, *If they were not both extream faulty and commentitious, they might be Evidence in this Case.* But *Richerius*, the honest *Sorboniſt, in Hiſt. Concil. l.* 1. *c.* 2. § 6. ingenuously declares, That *these Epistles are prodigiously false*, the Forger of them being so ignorant as to call *Macarius* (who was then Bishop of *Jerusalem*) Bishop of *Constantinople*. Such unfair Dealing as this, and from a Pope at the Head of a Council, and in a special Decree, is enough to prejudice any reasonable Man against the pretended Authority which the Bishops of *Rome* have assumed; and it deserves no meaner a Reprehension, than to tax them with the highest Impudence for palming upon the World false Citations of History, which every Capacity can contradict. *Vid. Synopſ. Can. Eccleſ. Latin. Annot. p.* 53, 54. From all these Falsities this Chapter concludes, "That we ought to pay the same, nay greater Deference, if possible, to the Apostolick Decrees, than we pay to the Four first General Councils, since without the Apostolick Authority they are invalid." But this Conclusion no Man in his Senses will allow, that has read or heard of the Premisses; except it be those of their own Persuasion, who deny themselves the Liberty and Use of their Senses.

In

In the Year 1078. Pope *Gregory* VII. held a Council at *Rome*, wherein he endeavours to fix the ſole Right and Power of Inveſtitures in the Apoſtolick See, and which by frequently repeated Attempts he at laſt obtained. And notwithſtanding in ſeveral Canons, made in this Council, he rubs very hard upon many of his Predeceſſors, and even upon himſelf in the Caſe of Simony and other Crimes; yet he ſhews not ſo much Concern for any Thing as the Inveſtitures, and which he places in the Front of theſe Canons. But whatever Pope *Gregory* deſign'd (whoſe Ambition was vaſtly aſpiring) the Editors ſeem to have a Mind to out-do him, and in the Caſe of Inveſtitures too; otherwiſe they would not take upon them to inſert what they ſeem to have no Authority for. In the Beginning of this Council there are inſerted Three and thirty Titles of Canons, which Canons themſelves are loſt, and only the Twelve following left. Very good Fortune truly, that the Two firſt of theſe Twelve, which concern and ſettle Inveſtitures in the Pontificate, ſhould eſcape. But then I would gladly know, how that Addition came to be annex'd to the Second Canon, and which *Labbé* ſays in the Margin, *T.* 10. *p.* 373. his great Favourite *Hugo Flaviniacenſis* has not in his Chronicle. Indeed conſidering the Texture of the Thing, it looks like an intended Inſertion, and is thus: "Which if any "ſhall preſume, (*meaning the taking Inveſtitures of "Churches from a Lay-Hand*) let him know, that "ſuch Inveſtiture is void by Apoſtolick Authority, "and that he ſhall ſtand excommunicated till he "has made plenary Satisfaction." I muſt confeſs, ſince *Labbé* would oblige the World to believe him in the great Character he gives this *Hugo Flaviniac*, calling him in *T.* 9. the *Incomparable Treaſure* of the Eleventh Century, I am as willing to believe him

in his own marginal Note aforeſaid; and that ſince this latter Part of the Second Canon, relating to the Right of Inveſtitures in the Apoſtolick See not being in his beloved *Hugo*'s *Incomparable Treaſure*, I am very inclinable to believe they are his, or his Friend *Binius*'s, or belong to ſome ſuch affectionate Favourer and Champion of the Pontificate. And this I am the more apt to conclude from *Labbé* himſelf, who publiſh'd this *Hugo*'s Chronicle from the Original MSS. in the *Claromontan* Library, wherein he has not acted the Part of a fair Editor; for in the former Part he hath left out many vulgar Things, and at the ſame Time tranſcrib'd from ſome others ſeveral uſeleſs trifling Scraps, which no honeſt and ingenuous Lover of Eccleſiaſtick Hiſtory can ever be thought to deplore the Want of. Had *Hugo* been that valuable Treaſure, his Admirer *Labbé* had the leſs Occaſion to correct him; and if there had been any Thing *vulgar*, a ſmall Note would have excus'd it: But then after all to play the Part of an Inſerter, looks not fair; and that Editor which ſhall inſert in one Thing, may juſtly be ſuſpected to do ſo in another; and therefore if *Labbé* is faulty, either in Imagination or in Fact, he has brought the Diſgrace upon himſelf. *Cav. Hiſt. Lit. Par.* 1. *p.* 636.

The Affair of Inveſtitures is again and again over-hal'd by the Editors themſelves, as well as by the Popes; and *Labbé* is ſo fond of the nauſeous Flattery his Favourite *Hugo Flaviniac* beſtows on this Pope, that he cannot forbear tranſcribing more of it than he or his Hiſtorian can prove in the Character of this Pope, and eſpecially in the Buſineſs of Inveſtitures, which, he ſays, having been unlawfully uſurp'd by the Laity, he reſtored to the Church. *T.* 10. *p.* 375. Indeed, as to Inveſtitures, he wreſted them, partly by Force, partly be Eccleſiaſtical

ſiaſtical Cenſures, out of the Hands of the Laity; which cannot fairly be called Reſtitution, for that implies a former Right. Beſides, how can *Labbé* or his Friend *Hugo* ſay, That Inveſtitures had been unlawfully uſurp'd by the Laity, when the Right of them very often was only in the Laity. This is plain from ſome Canons, which in old Time gave the Founders of Churches the Liberty of diſpoſing of them; that is, of Preſenting a Prieſt, with the Approbation of the Biſhop. I am ſure it was a violent Uſurpation in Pope *Gregory* to wreſt this Right from thoſe in whom it was inveſted.

But to go through with the Matter, Pope *Gregory* again in a *Roman* Synod, *A. D.* 1080. depoſing the Emperor *Henry*, and placing *Rodulph* in his Room, he repeats the Chapters or Canons relating to Inveſtitures in the XVth *Roman* Council. To which is added, a Directory for the Election of a Pope, which, becauſe it was ſeldom (if ever) obſerv'd, I ſhall inſert. "As often as the Paſtor of "any Church ſhall die, another is to be canoni- "cally put in his Room, at the Inſtance of the "Biſhop Viſiter, who receives his Orders from the "Apoſtolick or Metropolitan See; and the Cler- "gy and People laying aſide all Secular Ambition, "Fear, or Favour, ſhall chooſe for themſelves a "Paſtor according to the Will of God, and with "the Conſent of the Apoſtolick or Metropolitan "See. But if there be any Corruption in the Caſe, "the Election ſhall be void." If we look back or forward into the Elections of the Biſhops of *Rome*, what Briberies, what Murders, what enormous Irregularities have there been acted at moſt of them! And we need not go far back for foul and undue Elections. The Editors themſelves tell us, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1, 2. *in Marg.* That the Popes *Nicolas* and *Alexander* II. were elected by *Hildebrand*'s Means;

in his own marginal Note aforeſaid; and that ſince this latter Part of the Second Canon, relating to the Right of Inveſtitures in the Apoſtolick See not being in his beloved *Hugo*'s *Incomparable Treaſure*, I am very inclinable to believe they are his, or his Friend *Binius*'s, or belong to ſome ſuch affectionate Favourer and Champion of the Pontificate. And this I am the more apt to conclude from *Labbé* himſelf, who publiſh'd this *Hugo*'s Chronicle from the Original MSS. in the *Claromontan* Library, wherein he has not acted the Part of a fair Editor; for in the former Part he hath left out many vulgar Things, and at the ſame Time tranſcrib'd from ſome others ſeveral uſeleſs trifling Scraps, which no honeſt and ingenuous Lover of Eccleſiaſtick Hiſtory can ever be thought to deplore the Want of. Had *Hugo* been that valuable Treaſure, his Admirer *Labbé* had the leſs Occaſion to correct him; and if there had been any Thing *vulgar*, a ſmall Note would have excus'd it: But then after all to play the Part of an Inſerter, looks not fair; and that Editor which ſhall inſert in one Thing, may juſtly be ſuſpected to do ſo in another; and therefore if *Labbé* is faulty, either in Imagination or in Fact, he has brought the Diſgrace upon himſelf. *Cav. Hiſt. Lit. Par.* 1. *p.* 636.

The Affair of Inveſtitures is again and again over-hal'd by the Editors themſelves, as well as by the Popes; and *Labbé* is ſo fond of the nauſeous Flattery his Favourite *Hugo Flaviniac* beſtows on this Pope, that he cannot forbear tranſcribing more of it than he or his Hiſtorian can prove in the Character of this Pope, and eſpecially in the Buſineſs of Inveſtitures, which, he ſays, having been unlawfully uſurp'd by the Laity, he reſtored to the Church. *T.* 10. *p.* 375. Indeed, as to Inveſtitures, he wreſted them, partly by Force, partly be Eccleſiaſtical

ſiaſtical Cenſures, out of the Hands of the Laity; which cannot fairly be called Reſtitution, for that implies a former Right. Beſides, how can *Labbé* or his Friend *Hugo* ſay, That Inveſtitures had been unlawfully uſurp'd by the Laity, when the Right of them very often was only in the Laity. This is plain from ſome Canons, which in old Time gave the Founders of Churches the Liberty of diſpoſing of them; that is, of Preſenting a Prieſt, with the Approbation of the Biſhop. I am ſure it was a violent Uſurpation in Pope *Gregory* to wreſt this Right from thoſe in whom it was inveſted.

But to go through with the Matter, Pope *Gregory* again in a *Roman* Synod, *A. D.* 1080. depoſing the Emperor *Henry*, and placing *Rodulph* in his Room, he repeats the Chapters or Canons relating to Inveſtitures in the XVth *Roman* Council. To which is added, a Directory for the Election of a Pope, which, becauſe it was ſeldom (if ever) obſerv'd, I ſhall inſert. "As often as the Paſtor of "any Church ſhall die, another is to be canoni- "cally put in his Room, at the Inſtance of the "Biſhop Viſiter, who receives his Orders from the "Apoſtolick or Metropolitan See; and the Cler- "gy and People laying aſide all Secular Ambition, "Fear, or Favour, ſhall chooſe for themſelves a "Paſtor according to the Will of God, and with "the Conſent of the Apoſtolick or Metropolitan "See. But if there be any Corruption in the Caſe, "the Election ſhall be void." If we look back or forward into the Elections of the Biſhops of *Rome*, what Briberies, what Murders, what enormous Irregularities have there been acted at moſt of them! And we need not go far back for foul and undue Elections. The Editors themſelves tell us, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1, 2. *in Marg.* That the Popes *Nicolas* and *Alexander* II. were elected by *Hildebrand*'s Means;

for he commanded that *Bruno*, afterwards *Leo* IX. ſhould be elected; and it is not to be queſtioned, but that he, who by his mighty Influence could command the Election of others, and who, for Twenty Years before his own Advancement, had govern'd the Church of *Rome* as arbitrarily as if himſelf had been Pope, could eaſily make uſe of the ſame Means to thruſt himſelf into St. *Peter's* Chair when he ſaw Opportunity. So that *Labbé* and his Friend *Hugo Flaviniac.* might have ſpar'd their Pains in dawbing ſo much Flattery on the Man, as ſaying, *He was conſecrated in Righteouſneſs and Holineſs.*

This Year likewiſe the Editors pretend a Council at *Langres*, which, becauſe it was held (as they ſay) in Oppoſition to Lay-Inveſtitures, they will thruſt in; though, as they acknowledge, they have little Ground for it: For *Labbé*, *T.* 10. *p.* 397, introducing this Council with a *Some* (he knows not who, nor from whence) *who aſſert there was a Council held at* Langres *againſt Lay-Inveſtitures*; immediately corrects himſelf, and ſays, "*Hugo Fla-* "*viniac.* who liv'd in thoſe Times, and ſtrictly knew "the Life and Actions of *Hugo* Biſhop of *Dian*, "who preſided in this Council, takes no Notice "of it." Which is as much as to ſay, if he durſt have ſpoken out, that he did not believe what he had firſt aſſerted: But becauſe it looks with an evil Eye on Lay-Inveſtitures, it muſt be put in, tho' without any Authority. It's not to be queſtioned, but that *Hugo Flaviniac.* whom *Labbé* ſo much ador'd, and who was a great Advocate for the Pontificate, would have taken Notice of this Council, if there had been any ſuch in his Time.

The Year following, and in the Year 1084, Pope *Gregory* purſues the Emperor and his Party

with repeated Anathema's, which receive their final Confirmation, *A. D.* 1085, in the Council of *Quintilinburg*; where, tho' they ſuffer'd a certain Clergyman of *Bamberg* named *Gunibert* to queſtion the Pope's Supremacy and Infallibility, they overrul'd him with this General Maxim, *The Diſciple is not above his Maſter*, and that, *the Greater ought not to be judged of the Leſs*; at the ſame Time ratifying the two foreſaid Points, producing the Decrees of the Holy Fathers in Behalf of the Supremacy of the Apoſtolick See, and that it was not lawful for any to queſtion the Judgment of its Biſhop. In the End of this Synod, the Sentence of Anathema is pronounc'd with lighted Candles againſt *Guibert*, as an Invader of the Holy See, *Hugo Albus*, and *John* of *Portua*, Anticardinals, and Favourers of *Guibert*, with ſeveral others of the ſame Party. To revenge which, in the Month of *May* the ſame Year, the Emperor *Henry*, in a Royal and Synodal Aſſembly at *Mentz*, demands of all there preſent to ſign the Depoſition of *Hildebrand*, and approve of the Ordination of *Guibert*. Thus theſe two contending Parties null'd and unravel'd what each had done in Oppoſition to the other, till *Gregory* VII. after a troubleſome Twelve Years Pontificate, was forc'd to quit the Stage of the World, and leave the Greatneſs of the Court of *Rome* (whoſe Foundation he had with much Art and Labour laid) to be enlarg'd by his Succeſſors; and which they as induſtriouſly purſued as he had begun. Accordingly,

[1086.] Pope *Victor* III. is appointed by *Gregory* VII. as his Succeſſor; who, conſidering the grand Deſigns of *Gregory*, was the fitteſt Perſon to ſucceed him. He was the only Son of the Prince of *Beneventum*, being at firſt called *Dauferius*, afterwards *Deſiderius*, and when choſen Pope, he aſſum'd the

Name of *Victor* III. He was first a Monk in the Monastery of *Cassinum*, of which in the Year 1056, he was made Abbot. Afterwards, in the Year 1059, he was by Pope *Nicolas* II. ordained Priest, and likewise made a Cardinal. He was very fond of a Monastick Life, and yet a zealous Asserter of what Advantages the Pontificate had gain'd upon the Regale. He very honourably received *Gregory* VII. in his Flight from *Rome* at his Monastery, *A. D.* 1084, at which Time *Gregory* was so charm'd with him, that the Year following, at his Death, he appointed him his Successor. Notwithstanding which, and the Consent of the Bishops and Cardinals in the Election, after a Year's Retirement to his Monastery, he was not without great Importunity persuaded to take the Papacy upon him in the Council of *Capua*. But when he had once accepted the Chair, he set himself as heartily to the great Work his Predecessor had begun as any of them; for being consecrated in *May*, the *August* following he called a Council at *Beneventum*, in which he anathematizes *Guibert* the Antipope with his Adherents, forbids Conversation with Excommunicates, condemns Lay-Investitures, and threatens all Bishops, Abbots, and Clergy, who shall receive any Benefice or Dignity from Lay-Hands, with Excommunication. But his Reign being short, he could not be expected to go far in answering the Expectation of *Gregory* VII. However he gave a Taste of his Inclinations, and what he left unfinish'd, his Successors as carefully pursu'd. As for the Manner of his Death, the Editors in the Life of this Pope are silent, being, I suppose, unwilling to own it was by Poison, lest the World should expect the Reason of it; and therefore they only say, *That he went to the Lord.* But the Addition of *Labbé* to this Pope's Life sets this Affair in another Light; and which makes no small

ſmall Diſcoveries too in other Incroachments. The Firſt is in the Caſe of the dying Pope's nominating his Succeſſor: The Second in the Cardinals more particularly being concerned in the Election of the Pope. The true Reaſon undoubtedly was to bring theſe into Precedents, though never ſo foul and indirect, otherwiſe they would not ſo roughly have introduced them, and accompanied them with ſo black and irregular Circumſtances. The Life of Pope *Victor* owns, that Pope *Gregory* VII. at his Death named *Deſiderius* his Succeſſor; which *Labbé* confirms out of his Favourite *Hugo Flaviniac. Chron. p.* 232. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 413. "Our Lord, "Pope *Gregory*, ſays he, of Bleſſed Memory, be- "ing detain'd at *Salernum* by a grievous Sickneſs, "of which he afterwards died, the Biſhops and "*Roman* Cardinals met, intreating him to name "his Succeſſor; and he, pauſing a little, replied, "*Chooſe whom ye will of theſe Three, the Biſhop of* "Oſtia, Luca, *or* Lyons." This is quite contrary to the Practice of the *Roman* Church to this Time; for when there was a free Election of a Biſhop of *Rome*, (which, according to the Editors, was but ſeldom) it was by the *Clergy and People of* Rome; (they are their Words:) And when any Emperor or King nominated a Biſhop to them, (as the *Gothick* Kings for the moſt Part did) ſtill the Election went in the Name of the *Clergy and People of* Rome. And leſt this ſhould grow cold, they are reſolved, by a quick Repetition of it, to work it into a Cuſtom, as we ſhall ſee in the Pontificate of *Urban* II. the next Pope. The Cardinals being here named, both in the Life of *Victor* II. and in the above-cited Place of *Hugo Flaviniac.* is with no other Deſign than to have it taken Notice of, that in this Pope's Election only the Biſhops and Cardinals are made uſe of; for by this Time the Cardinals

dinals were incorporated into a College, and therefore high Time for them to exert and shew themselves. But the Citation of *Labbé* out of *Hugo Flaviniac.* is but Part of his Addition to this Pope's Life; for at the End of it he says: "After *Gregory*, "*Desiderius* the Abbot of *Cassinum*, taking upon "him the Papacy, call'd himself *Victor*." Now what Sort of Election, Promotion, and Consecration his was, *Hugo* Bishop of *Lyons* very plainly expresses in his Epistle to the Countess *Matilda*, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 414, 415. in these Words: "As to the "Election of the Abbot of *Cassinum*, you were sufficiently appris'd of it before I came to *Rome*, to "which I, and several of my Brethren, Sons of "the Holy *Roman* Church, preferring the Glory "of Man to that of God, consented." Here was a wicked Connivance and Consent, and which the subsequent Words explain; for, *ibid. p.* 414. this same *Hugo* of *Lyons* repeats several notorious Facts which Pope *Victor* reported of himself, and in a boasting Manner, in the Presence of the Bishops and Cardinals: "Such as his having sworn "to the Emperor *Henry* to assist him in obtaining "the *Roman* Empire; and that it was at his Instigation and Perswasion that *Henry* invaded the "Territories of St. *Peter*, and advanced to *Rome*. "How often hath he openly with his own Mouth "not only invalidated the Decrees of his Master, "Pope *Gregory*, and other Holy Fathers, but null'd "them in Fact? And in how many Places has "he affirmed, that his Election was not according "to the Will of God, but tumultuously done, *&c?*" But perhaps they will say this was to put by the Election, he being more fond of a Monastick Life. Certainly no Man can be compell'd in this Case: But supposing this Election to be an Act of Force, his Way of eluding it was foul and scandalous; for

if

if the Stories he tells of himſelf, with Deſign to put off or null the Election, were true, he makes himſelf a very infamous Traytor to the Cauſe he profeſſes; but if falſe, he tells ſo many Untruths, which are not only a ſcandalous Slander on the Character of others, but doing a notorious publick Evil to procure a private Good to himſelf, in a lazy uſeleſs Retirement. The reſt of his Character from the ſame Author is ſtill as black and ſcandalous; for *ibid. p.* 415. he ſays, "That being "ſummoned to the Council of *Capua*, he and "others obey'd: Where, as they were proceeding "to an Election, they found the Abbot (*i. e. Victor* III.) wheedling and cajoling the Electors to "force him to accept the Papacy; which Trick "of his being ſoon found out, the Biſhops that "were ſummoned to the Election with *Witmund* "the Monk, contriv'd how to outwit him: Therefore juſt as he was ready to reſume the Enſigns "of the Pontificate, and to re-accept the Election "ſo often declined by him, the foreſaid Party began to exclaim againſt the Levity of the Abbot, "declaring in the Hearing of all, that they would "not give their Conſent, unleſs he ſubmitted to "a Canonical Examination, and cleared his Reputation of ſome Things charged upon him "ſince his Election: Which he taking in great "Diſdain, declared he would neither ſubmit to "an Examination, nor accept of the Election; "by this Means giving Opportunity for a new "Election. Wherefore *Witmund* the Monk, by "the Advice of the Biſhop of *Oſtia*, publickly "cry'd out, That ſo infamous a Perſon ought not "to be elected or ordained Biſhop of *Rome*, ſince "it was plain beyond Diſpute that he was ſo, becauſe he ſtood excommunicated a whole Year "by Pope *Gregory*, and had done no Canonical

"Pen-

" Pennance." A few Lines further the ſame Author goes on with this *Victor*'s Character, *ibid. p.* 415. telling, " How the Abbot, void of Grace, had " conſpired with the Governor, who were both " reconciled, on Condition that the Abbot ſhould " be Pope, and his Friend *Alfan* be made Biſhop " of *Salernum*. The next Day after Dinner, the " Abbot, and others, having taken a Nap after a " Debauch, (*Vino obtinente ſuperiora, ib.*) the Abbot " [Oh horrid!] declares himſelf, being ſupported " by the Intereſt of the Governor, the Biſhop of " *Oſtia*, and all the reſt of us ignorant of the Matter. Things going on at this Rate, the Biſhop " of *Oſtia*, who hitherto agreed with us in all " Things, as ſoon as he ſaw that the Abbot, thro' " the Power of Prince *Jordan*, intended to go to " *Rome* to be conſecrated, fearing the Loſs of his " Dignity, if the Abbot ſhould be conſecrated by " another Hand, tacks about, and forgetting his " Promiſe and Contract with us, to his utter " Shame, makes his Peace with the Abbot, and " pays him the Reverence due to a Pope.—Therefore being thus conſecrated by the Biſhop of " *Oſtia*, as he was ſaying Maſs at St. *Peter*'s, he " was ſtruck by the immediate Judgment of God: " And although, conſidering his Errors, he was " not very haſty in depoſing himſelf, he called his " Brethren of *Caſſinum*, and commanded them to " carry him thither, and to bury him, not like a " Pope, but an Abbot.

What a horrid Arraignment is here from a Biſhop of the ſame Church, and preſent Witneſs of all the Proceedings at that Time in this great Affair! The Crimes charged upon this Supreme and Infallible Guide being no leſs than Perfidy and Treachery, in betraying the Church and Empire; ſtanding excommunicate and unreconcil'd; a Violator

lator of the Decrees of the Holy Fathers; a Simoniac, in confederating with the Secular Power to promote himſelf to the Pontificate; a graceleſs Wretch, a Debauchee, and whom the Juſtice of God purſu'd, for he was poiſon'd in a Draught out of the Holy Chalice at his Abbey of *Caſſinum*. The Editors, and their Darling, *Hugh Flaviniac.* are utterly ſilent in the diſmal Character of this Pontiff by the Biſhop of *Lyons*; they ſpeaking in his Favour, and extolling his Power; nothing like throwing Dirt on him appearing in the whole Courſe of their Writing. And for what Reaſon *Labbé* ſhould introduce this Author painting Pope *Victor* in ſuch Colours, I cannot conceive: It's certain it cannot proceed from any Candour or Ingenuity in him, for he always ſhews himſelf a ſtrenuous Champion and Aſſerter of the Pontificate, as has been before obſerved. There is nothing in all this Epiſtle of the Biſhop of *Lyons* which ſeems to carry any Shadow or Colour of excuſing any Thing ſaid in Prejudice of this Pope, except it be the Concluſion; and I am apt to believe it was for the Sake of that, that *Labbé* has inſerted the whole Character of this Pope as black as it is: For that, ſays he, *though he was not over-haſty in depoſing himſelf, conſidering his Errors*, (which indeed were many and great) *he commanded that he ſhould be buried as an Abbot, not as a Pope:* And thus diveſting himſelf of the Papacy, he diſcharges himſelf of all his former Wickedneſs. Truly, (as I have before hinted) if I were to adviſe theſe Gentlemen, they ſhould either forbear to aſſert the Infallibility and Supremacy, or back their Aſſertions with better Arguments, and honeſter Authority; or at leaſt forbear introducing Proof, which utterly condemn their Practices.

The

The Four Books of Dialogues written by *Victor* III. concerning the Miracles of St. *Benedict*, and other Acts of the Monks of *Caſſinum*, are one abſurd, ridiculous, fabulous Legend, unbecoming the Majeſty and Gravity of the Chriſtian Religion; and, whatever they might be deſign'd for, are fit for nothing but to move Deriſion and Contempt; and which plainly ſhew Want of Judgment in the Writer, and Truth in the Matter of Fact aſſerted.

[1088.] Pope *Urban* II. call'd before *Otto*, ſucceeds *Victor* III. by his own particular Appointment a little before his Death; ſo that now the Manner of one Pope's naming his Succeſſor is become a Cuſtom: However, to keep up the Face of an Election, this Nomination of the preceding Pope is confirmed by the Cardinals hitherto. This is that *Otto* Biſhop of *Oſtia*, of whom *Hugo* Archbiſhop of *Lyons* in the laſt Pope's Reign ſo ſeverely complains of, and inveighs againſt in his Epiſtle to the Counteſs *Mathilda*, for baſely changing Party, and ſiding with Pope *Victor*; as has been ſpoken of before. And truly, if we conſider the Abilities of the Man, and his Merits from the Papacy for its new ſet-up Sovereignty, Pope *Victor* could not have fix'd on a more proper Perſon; for he was well vers'd in Affairs of this Nature in the Time of *Gregory* VII. being in the Year 1083, ſent Legate by him to the Emperor *Henry* IV. by whom he was taken up and confined. The Year following he proclaimed the Sentence of Excommunication againſt the Emperor and his Party throughout *Germany*. In the Year 1085, in the Council in *Quintilinburg* in *Germany*, *Otto* preſided as Legate from *Gregory* VII. where he condemned *Wecilo* Archbiſhop of *Mentz* of Hereſy, for holding as Doctrine, That a Prince excommunicated by the Pope had not

not forfeited his Crown, though he was deprived of the Communion of the Church. So qualified a Perſon for the Intereſt of the Supremacy could not fail of Succeſs: Nor could Pope *Gregory* and *Victor* any where have found out one ſo fit to carry on what they had begun; eſpecially *Victor*, who beſides in a great Meaſure owed the Pontificate to *Otto*'s Treachery: For if *Otto*, then Biſhop of *Oſtia*, had continued firm to the Intereſt he was engaged in with the Archbiſhops of *Lyons*, *Aix*, *Luca*, and others, the Abbot of *Caſſinum* would have found more Difficulty in obtaining the Papacy, than in changing his Name to *Victor* III. He it was that gave the Sanction to this pious Act, by conſecrating the Abbot Pope; and therefore highly merited to ſucceed him: Which he accordingly did; and the Firſt Publick Act of his was the Confirmation of all the former Sentences againſt *Guibert* the Antipope, and the Emperor *Henry*, and his Party, in a Council at *Rome*, *A. D.* 1089.

In the Year 1090, he calls a Council at *Melfi* in *Apulia*, wherein Duke *Roger*, whom the Editors call a Vaſſal of the Holy *Roman* Church, is inveſted, taking an Oath of Fidelity to the Pope. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 478. In this Council likewiſe were conſtituted Sixteen Canons: The Firſt of which is a very honeſt and ſevere one againſt Simony. This indeed is an excellent Precaution in all Governors of the Church, where obſerv'd. No Councils have more frequently repeated this Canon againſt Simoniacks, and no Sort of People ever leſs obſerved it: And it is worth Obſervation, that thoſe Popes who have Simoniacally and Irregularly intruded into St. *Peter*'s Chair, have generally enter'd upon the Pontificate with this or ſome ſuch ſpecious Pretence of Sanctity. Inveſtitures from Lay-hands are ſtrictly forbid in this Council, as

alſo

alſo Concubinage of the Clergy, and ſeveral Things inſiſted on by former Popes; ſo that upon the Acceſſion of every Pope all old Quarrels are reviv'd that relate to the Grandeur of the *Roman* Pontiff; wherein they ſeldom fail of carrying their Point. The Sixteenth Canon of this Council is a moſt wholeſome Part of Eccleſiaſtick Diſcipline, than which no humane Means can contribute more to the preſent and future Quiet of a Penitent's Conſcience. This Canon is very poſitive againſt falſe Pennances; and leſt there ſhould be a Miſtake or Miſunderſtanding of the Terms, the Canon very aptly explains it ſelf, calling it falſe Pennance, when, neglecting many others, we repent of one Sin only; or when we repent of one, we continue in others. This is fairly ſtrengthen'd from St. *James*, *c.* 2. *v.* 10. *Whoſoever ſhall keep the whole Law, and yet faileth in one Point, is guilty of all.* How the Doctrine of Diſpenſations will agree with this, I leave the Reader to judge: Surely ſuch Reſerves in Sin vaſtly impede our Reconciliation with God; and he that repents of one or ſeveral Sins, and deliberately and connivingly continues in others, can be ſaid to perform but a lame Pennance: Such imperfect Reconciliation is next to none, for it excludes God's aſſiſting Grace, which ſhould ſtrengthen us in the Performance of that great Duty of Repentance, and would profanely proſtitute thoſe great Attributes of God, his Mercy, and Long-ſuffering, to ſome baſe humane End.

A. D. 1091, a Council was called at *Beneventum*, in which *Guibert* the Antipope and his Party are again excommunicated. In this Council, according to *Baronius*, Pope *Urban* beſtow'd a Pontifical Mitre on *Peter* the Abbot of *Cava*; the Uſe of which he declin'd, tho' the Pope inſiſted on it:

Which he is ſuppoſed to have done, ſays *Surius* in his Life, for no other Reaſon than to condemn, by this Example of Humility, the Arrogance and Pride of thoſe that undeſervedly extol themſelves, and aſſume the Honours of the Holy Church which they had no Right to.

A. D. 1092. The *Gallican* Church, in the Council of *Eſtampes*, rouz'd their ancient Genius and Courage; and, in the Struggle between them and *Ivo*, ſhew'd how unwilling they were to part with their Rights. The Cauſe of the Diſpute was this: *Godfrey* Biſhop of *Chartrain* having been depoſed by Pope *Urban* II. the Clergy and People of *Chartrain* choſe *Ivo* Abbot of *Belvac* in his Place, which Election the Pope likewiſe approved of. But *Richerius* Archbiſhop of *Sens*, and Metropolitan, refuſed to conſecrate *Ivo*; whereupon *Ivo* was under a Neceſſity of going to *Rome* for Conſecration, which he received from the Hands of Pope *Urban*, who wrote back to the People of *Chartrain*, and to Archbiſhop *Richerius*, in his Favour, threatning *Godfrey* and his Adherents with Excommunication if they did not deſiſt. Notwithſtanding theſe Menaces, *Richerius* refuſes to admit *Ivo*, diſperſing ſeveral Letters full of reproachful Calumny againſt him, and calling a Synod at *Eſtampes*, he, together with the Biſhops of *Paris*, *Meaulx*, and *Troyes*, calls *Ivo*'s Ordination in Queſtion, and accuſes him of Treaſon, for preſuming to receive Conſecration from the Apoſtolick See; nay they had proceeded to paſs Sentence of Depoſition againſt him, and Reſtitution of *Godfrey*, but for his timely Appeal to *Rome*. So that by this Time we may plainly ſee what Strength the Court of *Rome* had gained, that it could baffle the Attempts of the *Gallican* Biſhops to recover their Rights. That they have had Rights and Claims, and acted independently of the Biſhop of *Rome*, and

often oppoſed the unjuſt Judgment and Determination of that Court, we have often before ſhewn, as in the Caſe of the two *Hincmars*, of *Rhemes* and *Laon*, and others. But by what Injuſtice or Force ſoever the Biſhops of *Rome* had uſurp'd this exorbitant Power over the reſt of the *Weſtern* Church, 'tis moſt certain the *Gallican* Church had Rights independant of that of *Rome*; which Uſurpations Pope *Urban* II. as felonioufly and falſly maintains as he and his Predeceſſors had gain'd. We have already ſhewn, that *Ivo*'s Appeal to *Rome* prevented his Depoſition, ſo that *Richerius* and his Suffragans could not proceed. This Claim of Appealing to the See of *Rome*, Pope *Urban* juſtifies in his Twentieth Epiſtle to *Richerius*, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 443. *from ancient and Divine Inſtitution*, affirming, *not only Biſhops and Primates, but even Patriarchs, to be ſubject to the Biſhop of the Apoſtolick See; who knows, That all Appeals are made to him, and none from him; and that the ſole Power of judging in the Church is his, but that he is ſubject to the Judgment of none.* I muſt beg his Infallibility's Pardon in this; for we have already ſhewn ſeveral Inſtances from the Editors and other of the Pontifical Authors, of Popes having been try'd by others, as *Marcellinus*, *&c.* of the Faithful forſaking the Communion of Heretical and Infidel Popes, as *Liberius*; and in many of the Decretal Epiſtles, the Forgeries that have been made to maintain this Doctrine of Appeals to *Rome*; and, what is moſt abſurd, the very Forgeries, and own'd as ſuch by *Baronius*, *Bellarmine*, *Binius*, *Labbé*, *&c.* have often been produc'd in Favour of this Doctrine of Appeals. This muſt unavoidably give any one a juſt Prejudice to their pretended Univerſal Power, and an eaſy Judgment may determine ſafely againſt that Perſon who ſhall pretend to juſtify any Doctrine by Divine Inſtitution, whoſe humane Authority

rity is prov'd to be a moſt infamous Forgery and Cheat.

A. D. 1093. the Emperor *Henry* is again excommunicated, and about this Time the Pope encourages *Conrade* to rebel againſt his Father the Emperor *Henry* IV. who baniſhes and outlaws his Son, and declares his Son *Henry* V. *Cæſar.* This Story of *Conrade*'s being incited to rebel, has a quite different Turn given it by the Editors in this Pope's Life, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 421. "The Pope again, ſay they, "excommunicated King *Henry*, becauſe he had "impriſon'd *Praxes* the Empreſs, his lawful Wife, "and offer'd her to be raviſh'd by his Son and "others, and abſolves *Conrade* the Son for this Rea-"ſon, becauſe he would not obey his Father, to "commit Inceſt with his Mother." This is a Turn ſufficient to ſtrike any one with Horror; but the Editors had better have let this alone, unleſs they had ſhewn ſome Authority for what they had ſaid, having no other than that of *Berthold*, a violent Rebel, and implacable Enemy of his Sovereign *Henry* IV. But of him more hereafter. Beſides, as they ſuppoſe a Thing which was not done, (for *Conrade* did not raviſh his Mother, though they ſay his Father commanded him) there was the leſs Cauſe for the Pope to encourage the Son to riſe againſt the Father. But in this incredible Story of theirs againſt the Emperor, the Editors are guilty of a moſt inauſpicious Blunder. It is to be obſerv'd, That the Editors pretend no King or Prince can be made Emperor but by the Pope; (forgetting the Electoral College inſtituted long ago for that Purpoſe) and therefore they frequently call *Henry Pſeudo-Imperator*. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 402. And yet here, in this very Account, by which they would make *Henry* odious, they are guilty of a great Overſight; for they ſay, "The Pope ex-

" communicated King *Henry*, becauſe he had im-
" priſon'd *Praxes* the Empreſs, his lawful Wife."
Now I would fain know how *Praxes* could be Empreſs, when her Husband *Henry* was only King. But to ſhew a further Proof of theſe Inconſiſtencies, the running Title in *Labbé* calls him *Henricus* IV. *Imp.* all the Way.

In the Council of *Rhemes*, *A. D.* 1094. the Caſe of *Philip* King of *France* and *Bertrade* was only moved; but the ſame Year, at the Council of *Autun*, King *Philip*, the Emperor *Henry*, and *Guibert* the Antipope, with ſeveral Simoniacks and Incontinents, were excommunicated. But in the Year following, in the Councils of *Placentia* and *Clermont*, in which Pope *Urban* ſat in Perſon, the Affair of King *Philip*'s was quite determined, and he and his inceſtuous Wife excommunicated. As for *Philip*, it's beyond Diſpute he was a moſt notorious Offender, and that no Proceſs or Eccleſiaſtical Cenſure could be too ſevere; for his Crimes were Adultery and Inceſt in a very high Degree. He put away his lawful Wife *Berta*, and took *Bertrade*, the Daughter of *Simeon de Monte-fort*, and Wife of his near Kinſman *Fulco* Count of *Anjou*. Nor was he content with this, but he afterwards married her, and had her anointed Queen of *France*. Theſe are Crimes of a deep Die, ſuch as cannot be ſufficiently aggravated, nor eaſily atton'd for; but when the Editors mention any Thing of the Emperor *Henry* IV. from their Oracle *Berthold*, I muſt very often ſuſpend my Belief: For, in the firſt Place, *Berthold* was very early engaged in the Quarrel between *Gregory* VII. and the Emperor, to whom he was an implacable and dangerous Enemy, not only drawing his Pen, but his Sword, (tho' a Prieſt) againſt his lawful Sovereign. Pope *Gregory*, obſerving his Malice to his Prince, adapts him to Buſineſs

ſineſs ſuitable to his Genius; for he makes it as a Part of his Province, to receive into the Boſom of the Church all ſuch as ſhould revolt from *Cæſar* to the Pope: In which he did the Pope great Service, and no leſs Damage to his Maſter. In his Hiſtory, he treats the Emperor with much ill Manners, aſperſing him with Lies, incredible Calumnies, and all the immodeſt Expreſſions of a prejudic'd Mind, very diſagreeable and unentertaining to a modeſt Reader, that is ſearching for Truth. This Author is very much made uſe of by the Editors for the Time he writes, for he is an excellent Champion for the Pontificate, being very good at gloſſing over and defending any Thing that he thinks carries not a ſmooth Face for the Honour of it. An Inſtance of which we have in his Account of the Council of *Placentia*, upon which the Editors chiefly depend. "The Pope gaining Ground almoſt eve-
"ry where, calls a Council in the City of *Placen-*
"*tia*, in the midſt of the Schiſmaticks; to which
"were ſummon'd the Biſhops of *Italy*, *Burgundy*,
"*France*, *&c.* ſo that the Multitude of all Sorts
"which met here was ſo vaſt, that no one Church
"in the City could contain them; whereupon the
"Pope was forc'd to hold the Council in the open
"Field. But leſt this ſhould look irregular and mobbiſh, he gives it a ſmooth Turn, by ſaying,
"He did not this without the Authority of a good
"Example, for *Moſes*, the firſt Lawgiver, at the
"Command of God, taught the People their Du-
"ty in the Fields." This muſt certainly be granted *Berthold*, for I do not ſee where elſe but in the Fields *Moſes* could teach the People, who lived in nothing but Tents in the open Air. But he goes on, and ſays, "That our bleſſed Lord did not
"preach the Goſpel to his Diſciples in Houſes, but
"in the Mountain, and in the Fields." Here the

Compariſon holds leſs than in the former Example. There is a vaſt Difference between an Act of Neceſſity, and an Act of Choice: Our Saviour indeed was often interrupted in the Temple and Synagogues, but yet we find he often taught in thoſe Places; but when he taught in the Fields or Mountains, or on Shipboard, it was an Act of Neceſſity, which was never allow'd to be brought into a Precedent. Again he goes on, and ſays, "Sometimes likewiſe we celebrate Maſs juſtifiably "enough out of the Church, in caſe of Neceſſity, "tho' we know there are Churches peculiarly appropriated to that Office." *Berthold*, I doubt, was no good Canoniſt, elſe he might have conſider'd, that the Caſe of Neceſſity he mentions here is by the Canon called Sickneſs, when the Penitent cannot go to the Church; otherwiſe, there are many Canons which poſitively forbid the Celebration of Maſs out of the Church.

In the Pontificate of Pope *Urban* II. began the Orders of *Carthuſians*, *Ciſterſians*, *Shady Vally*, and *Antonians*: and indeed this Century, from the Beginning, is very remarkable for the Encreaſe and Power of Monkery in general. This I take to be chiefly encourag'd by the ſeveral Popes that had been Abbots; who being promoted to the higheſt Pitch of Honour in the Church, had ſtill a great Regard to the Orders they had been of, not only adding to the Foundation ſeveral Immunities and Gifts, but either inſtituting or confirming new ones. This gave them a mighty Opportunity of enlarging their Societies and Incomes, eſpecially in thoſe Countries where the Sovereigns had ſubmitted to the Papal Yoke. A great Inſtance of which we have in our King *Edgar*, who in the Year 960, or thereabout, founded and endowed 47 Monaſteries for Men and Women, promiſing to make them 50.

He

He enlarg'd the Privileges of the Monaſteries of *Glaſtenbury* and *Malmsbury*, and did ſo many Things in Favour of the Monks, that the Secular Clergy were wholly eclips'd by their growing Greatneſs, which they miſerably labour'd under at laſt; for having gotten the beſt and greateſt Part of the Churches into their Hands, they grew luxurious and proud, which ſoon provok'd the Secular Power to attempt a Reformation, which ended in a moſt inexcuſable and abominable Sacrilege.

But it is no Wonder that any Prince in the Intereſt of the Pontificate ſhould do ſo, conſidering what the Popes themſelves had done in ſeveral Councils in Favour of the Monks. Pope *Urban*, towards the End of this Century, declares himſelf amply in their Intereſt; for at the Council of *Niſmes*, *A. D.* 1096. in which he preſided, there are ſeveral Canons highly in Favour of the Monks. The Firſt breaks the Way towards the ridding them of the Epiſcopal Juriſdiction; for in any Church which belongs to a Monaſtery, the Biſhop of the Dioceſs ſhall not collate any Prieſt to it without the Conſent of the Abbot. Here is a plain Encroachment on the Epiſcopal Power. The Second Canon is a direct Panegyrick on the Monaſtick State, making the Efficacy of the Prieſtly Office in them to be moſt excellent, calling them Angels, and that as they are more ſublime by their Retreat from the World, they are ſo much the more excellent. The Third Canon is a partial, ungentile, and unchriſtian Determination in Behalf of the Monks, making their Miniſtry preferable to that of Secular Prieſts. "They muſt needs, ſays the Canon, be "more ſollicitous to pray for the Sins of Men, and "be more prevalent for their Pardon, who have "abandon'd the World, than Secular Prieſts, who "live in it." It may be thought a great Preſum-

ption for a private Perſon to queſtion the Power of a Synod, and the Truth of its Decrees: But when Synods decree Things in themſelves unreaſonable, and contrary to the expreſs Command of God, his Son our Saviour, and his Apoſtles, I think it no Breach of good Manners, or of Chriſtianity, to queſtion the Authority of ſuch a Synod. How can any Man call himſelf infallible, or with what Face can any Number of Men conjunctly ſo far depreciate an Order of God's own inſtituting, as to prefer an Order of humane Inſtitution to it! If a Man has a Mind to ſeclude himſelf from the World, it is either to gratify ſome private Humour, or his natural Inclination; at the beſt, he can but be ſaid to retire from the World in order to enjoy a more ſtrict Communion with God. This is well, I grant; yet this is ſtill but a private Good, affecting none but himſelf. Nor can he be ſaid to affect any one with his Example, for that cannot improve the World, nor illuſtrate or adorn his Station, whilſt it is private. It is like a Miſer's Diamond, which ſhines indeed, but is lock'd up in the Dark, and is to the World as uſeleſs as a Candle ſet under a Buſhel. It is contrary to the expreſs Command of our Saviour, *Let the Lights ſhine before Men*, (to which he ſubjoins the Reaſon, *That they may ſee your good Works, and glorify your Father which is in Heaven.* And, to condemn the lazy uſeleſs Life of all who neglect Opportunities of Improvement, he is at the Expence of a Parable, and pronounces a ſevere and heavy Sentence againſt the ſlothful Servant that hid his Talent. Men, to whom God has given great Abilities, ſhould produce their Talents, and not encloſe themſelves and their more uſeful Capacities within the melancholy Circle of Retirement. *No Man*, ſaith St. *Paul, lives to himſelf. Rom.* 14. 7. And *Cicero* ſayes, *No Man is born for himſelf.* Therefore

fore the greater our Endowments are, the more communicative ought we to be. All Benefits are ſo intended by the grand Donor of them, and we have a poſitive Command from our Bleſſed Lord to imitate the Author of them: *Be ye merciful, as your Heavenly Father alſo is merciful. Luke* 6. 36. To imitate God in all Things, is impoſſible; to imitate him in ſome Things, is Preſumption; but in Acts of Goodneſs he ſtrictly obliges us: And wherein do or can we more exactly copy after the glorious Original of Mercy, than in inſtructing the Ignorant, feeding and refreſhing their hungry and thirſty Souls by the Communication of thoſe Divine Graces and Benefits God has beſtowed on us. But this cannot be ſaid to be done by an unactive Recluſe, whoſe Retirement takes off from his Uſefulneſs, and his Example is loſt to the World. Such a Retreat deſtroys the End of Community, which is one great Intent of Man's Creation; it tends to unpeopling the World; would make it a Deſart; nay, ſoon diſſolve it. He that is thus inclin'd, (I may ſay, fond of himſelf) deſerves no other Remembrance than a *Hîc ſitus*, for he is dead and buried while he lives. But after all the imaginary Beauties of this fanciful Retirement, as wicked as the World is, the Recluſe will have a Share in the Management of it; and there are no Charms in this holy Receſs Proof againſt Secular Promotion: Witneſs the Prevarication of Pope *Victor* III. who could find no Argument in his Cell, after a Twelvemonths Deliberation, ſtrong enough to encounter worldly Ambition. I beg Pardon for this Digreſſion, and return.

This Council of *Niſmes* was the Firſt publick Declaration in that Way in Favour of the Monaſtick State; which, how far it hath gain'd Ground,

all

all Monaſteries and Colleges ſince founded and endowed but too plainly demonſtrate.

[1099.] The Manner of a Pope's naming his Succeſſor is now paſs'd into a ſecure Cuſtom; for it is the Third Time repeated in Pope *Paſchal* II. and the Way of changing their Names is as faſhionably preſerved as any other Innovation; for this Pope's Name was *Rainer*, Abbot of the Monaſtry of St. *Laurence* and St. *Stephen*, whom, by the Advice and Perſwaſion of dying Pope *Urban*, the Clergy and People of *Rome* choſe Pope, as much againſt his Will, I ſuppoſe, as any of his Predeceſſors. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 620. This Unwillingneſs to accept the Pontificate, which the Editors ſo frequently make Uſe of in the Beginning of moſt of the Popes Lives, is ſo unneceſſary a Piece of Hypocriſy and Cant, that no Body can be impos'd upon by it, eſpecially conſidering that this Holy Rape from their Monaſtick Retirement is what they have moſt affectionately courted, and too many of them have made Uſe of Means very unjuſtifiable, either in a Civil or Eccleſiaſtick Senſe, to obtain what they have ſo ſeemingly and ſelf-denyingly pretended to decline, and yet accept. This ſavours much of Ambition, which can tranſform it ſelf into any Shape to accompliſh its End.

Pope *Paſchal*'s Abilities were undoubtedly well known to his Predeceſſor *Urban*, who had never recommended him to the Chair, if he had not expected great Things from him in Favour of the Pontificate againſt the *Regale*; which indeed at that Time lay but in a gaſping Condition. and in vain ſtruggling with inſuperable Pangs. This Pope *Paſchal* II. proſecuted with as much Heat as any before him; for to make ſure Work he tore up the Cauſe by the very Root in the Death of the Emperor *Henry* IV. whom he ſo cloſely and eagerly purſu'd, that he never quitted him till he

quitted

quitted the World. But theſe and many other Occurrences during this Pontificate we will relate in Order.

He was by the Name of *Rainer* bred a Monk in the Abbey of *Chiny*, and afterwards created Cardinal-Prieſt by Pope *Gregory* VII. Being thus early promoted, he, no doubt, inclined to purſue his own ambitious Ends, in proſecuting the Intereſt of the Papacy; and therefore was the fitteſt and moſt likely Pope to ſecure what had thus proſperouſly (though ſurreptitiouſly) ſucceeded. In the Beginning of his Pontificate, *Guibert* the Antipope, who had given much Diſturbance to the *Roman* See, by holding up a Schiſm of One and twenty Years, dies in the Caſtle of St. *Angelo*. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 620. The Inquietude which threaten'd the Church, by the Obtruſion of Three Pſeudopopes ſucceſſively, was ſoon diſſipated by the powerful Influence and Intereſt of Pope *Paſchal*; who, ſeeing all Things in a profound Tranquillity at *Rome*, began to caſt about with himſelf how to carry on the Projects which his Three Predeceſſors had ſo ſucceſsfully to his Reign maintained.

In the Council of *Poictou*, *A. D.* 1100, there are ſome Paſſages very remarkable, and eſpecially as coming from *Hugo Flaviniac.* the great Favorite of the Editors. In this Council there were many Things tranſacted; but the Two chief Cauſes were that of *Norigand* Biſhop of *Edua*, for Simony; and that of *Philip* King of *France*, in the Caſe of *Bertrade*, whom he had recall'd. The Caſe of *Norigand* had been firſt heard the *October* before, in the Council of *Valence* in *Dauphiny*, where he was ſuſpended *ab Officio*; and here in this Council of *Poictou* he was deprived of his Orders. But in the Relation of this, the Editors, out of their admired *Hugo Flaviniac. Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 720. make a Diſcovery

covery of ſome Thing, in the Acts of this Council, very inconſiſtent with their then claim'd Supremacy. The Council, and the Pope's Legates, *John* and *Benedict*, could not agree. "The Controverſy (ſay the Editors) continues, and the "Anſwers of the Cardinals, (*viz.* the Legates) "are rejected by the whole Council, inſiſting on "the Rights of the *Gallican* Church, in nothing "allowing their Authority to be infring'd, nor "conſenting to any Appeals." So that though the Pope preſided in this Council, and was repreſented in it by Two Legates; yet the *Gallican* Church inſiſted ſo much on her Right, that ſhe would not admit of the Arbitrary Supremacy the See of *Rome* had pretended to claim over the Weſtern Church. Had other Churches in *Europe*, as Part of the Catholick Church, inſiſted on their Rights with the ſame Courage the *Gallican* Church did, the See of *Rome* had not been *Univerſal*, as ſome are pleas'd to call it now. And it is much to be feared, that the Deluge of Blood which hath for many Years overflow'd the Chriſtian World, owes its Source to nothing ſo much as the unnatural Ambition and greedy Encroachment of the Court of *Rome*.

The Canons which were made in this Council of *Poictou* are very much in Favour of the Regular Clergy, the Monaſtick State prevailing, and getting Ground in moſt Parts: Nor was it likely to do otherwiſe, when the Biſhops of *Rome*, who for ſome Years about this Time had been Regulars, ſo affectionately eſpouſed their Intereſt. This enlarged their Privileges and Incomes; and from being made equal with the Secular Clergy, as in the Tenth Canon of this Council, where they are allow'd the ſame Privileges of Baptizing, Preaching, Impoſing Pennance, and Burying, they ſoon became

became ſuperior. And whereas theſe Privileges juſt mentioned, of Baptizing, *&c.* were to be performed but with the Command or Licence of the Biſhop of the Dioceſe, they at laſt grew ſo arrogant, that they threw off all Subjection to their Dioceſan, and by a lawleſs Liberty acted in all Dioceſes as if they were in their own. This was a fatal Blow, not only to Epiſcopacy, but to Diſcipline in general; for being ſupported by the Biſhop of *Rome*, they denied Obedience to any elſe: And for Canonical Cenſures, they were above the Reach of them, and would ſubmit to none but what ſquar'd with their Intereſt and Conveniency.

Conrad Abbot of *Urſperg*, another of the Editors Creatures, is guilty of a very great Overſight relating to the *Roman* Supremacy; for in the Firſt *Lateran* Council of this Century, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 727. *Urſperg*, *ad An.* 1102, *p.* 184. he tells us, "That "the Emperor *Henry*, after a Conference with the "Princes of *Germany*, determin'd to go to *Rome*, "and to call a General Council there about the "Calends of *February*, that not ſo much his Cauſe, "as that of the Apoſtolick Lord, being canonically "argued, a Catholick Union might be confirmed "between the Crown and the Prieſthood, which "had for ſo many Years been divided." Here it is plain, if *Conrad* relates Truth, that the Emperor had Power of calling a General Council; nay, and upon the Account of determining a Controverſy of a long Continuance between no leſs Perſons than the Pope and himſelf, and about eſtabliſhing a general Union between Church and State. But the Editors perhaps may ſay, in Defence of their Creature, that this never arriv'd to Fact, and therefore is no Teſtimony: But I muſt take Leave to ſay, that if there had been no ſuch Power in the Emperor, I can ſcarce perſwade my ſelf, or any one

one elſe, that the Hiſtorian, and a Friend of the Pontificate too, would have inſerted a Paſſage that was to have come to paſs if both Parties had agreed. But the ſame Hiſtorian goes on, and ſays: "Yet "it is certain, he (*i. e.* the Emperor) neither came "according to his Appointment, nor ſent any "Meſſage, acknowledging his Submiſſion to the "Apoſtolick Dignity." *Ibid.* This is very preposterous and inconſiſtent, that this Author ſhould firſt inveſt the Emperor with a Power of calling a General Council, and afterwards in the ſame Paragraph expect or imply, that this Power that could do ſo ſhould pay Subjection to one inferior to him in Temporals! But he goes on with this in the ſame Page, *ibid.* and ſeems to confirm rather than enervate the Imperial Power; for ſays he, "Nor is it to be forgotten, that he did not at-"tempt to put another Pope over his Head.

[*A. D.* 1104.] A Council was held at *Fuſſela* in *Spain*, in the Preſence of King *Alphonſus* VI. and in which *Richard* the Pope's Legate preſided. At this Time, and in this Part of the Weſtern Church, the Celibacy of the Clergy was ſo little underſtood or obſerved, that, notwithſtanding the preſſing Inſtances of the *Legate* to carry his Point, he could not prevail. This Council is not taken Notice of by the Editors, but may be found among the *Spaniſh* Councils, *T.* 3. *p.* 317. by *Sandovalius*.

The ſame Year was held the Second Lateran Council of this Century: In which Pope *Paſchal* excommunicates all the Favourers of Lay-Inveſtitures in *England*, eſpecially the Councellors of the King, who put him upon ſeizing them; and not only the Inveſters, but the Perſons inveſted, are deprived of the Communion of the Church. This Feud continued till the Year 1107, when in the Second Council of *London*, the Pope, by the Management

ment of his faithful Favourite *Anſelm*, gain'd a Confirmation of what he had long labour'd to ſettle in *England*; the King conſenting, that Inveſtitures ſhould not be diſpos'd of by the Laity.

The Emperor *Henry* IV. had with various Succeſs ſtruggled with ſeveral Popes about the Right of Inveſtitures, and ſeveral other Things. And indeed he had his Hands full enough, to engage the moſt formidable Champions of the Pontificate in the Perſon of *Gregory* VII. *Victor* III. *Urban* II. and *Paſchal* II. that ever poſſeſs'd St. *Peter*'s Chair. But at laſt, after a long and troubleſome Reign, an unnatural Rebellion of the Son againſt the Father, and the Subjects againſt their Prince, ſoon put an End to theſe Animoſities. *Cabbaſutius*, in his *Notit. Eccleſ. p.* 401. who gleans from *Berthold*, *Otho*, *Friſingenſ.* and *Marianus Scotus*, does not leave Pope *Paſchal* altogether clear of Suſpicion of being concerned in theſe Commotions againſt the Emperor, for he ſays, Sect. 2. "That *Henry* V. "ſhew'd a great Veneration and Reſpect to the "*Roman* See, and that when all *Germany* was in "Rebellion againſt his Father, he join'd with "them in Arms againſt him." Now with what Face a Prince could pretend to offer any Reſpect or Veneration to his Spiritual Father, when he was in open Rebellion againſt his Natural Father; or with what Conſcience a Spiritual Father could receive a Son rebelling againſt his Natural Father, and in ſo doing violating the firſt and greateſt Command of the Second Table, is very plain to any Judgment. It had been a greater Addition to the Character of the Firſt Biſhop to have perſwaded the Son and his rebellious Companions to return to their Duty, than to encourage them in their deteſtable, damnable Practices; which it is certain he did; for in the Year 1105, at the Council of

Mentz, he confirmed it to the World, by joining with the Biſhops and Princes of *Germany* in the Depoſing of *Henry* the Father. *Conrad* Abbot of *Urſperg* ſays, the Son was perſwaded by ſome Biſhops to renounce his Allegiance to his Father, (a Practice too often and fatally ſince imitated!) but *Cabbaſutius*, *ibid.* ſpeaks plainer, and ſays, " *Henry* " *Senior* being thus deſerted and hated of all, openly abdicates himſelf of the Empire, and reſigns " the Regalia into the Hands of his Son, whom " the People had choſen, and the Legates of the " Apoſtolick See had confirm'd. But becauſe this " was not an Act of Choice, but of Neceſſity, he " fled to *Liege*, where being kindly received, " he wrote Letters to the King of the *Celtæ*, ſetting forth the Hardſhip of his Caſe, and complaining of his ungrateful and rebellious Son, and " Pope *Paſchal*, whom he calls Incendiary of the " moſt unjuſt War, and Trumpeter of Rebellion." This Wants no Explanation, nor can any cover or excuſe this wicked Fact. It is plain here was a moſt unnatural Rebellion, and no leſs an Abetter and Fomenter of it than the Biſhop of the Firſt See.

Henry IV. being thus ſtrip'd of the Imperial Dignity, and all Things becoming his Character, can no longer bear up againſt the Fury of his Enemies, but overwhelm'd with Grief and Misfortunes, pays the laſt Debt to Nature at *Liege*. Death, one would naturally think, ſhould put an End to all Differences; but Malice will ſurvive, for Pope *Paſchal* is reſolv'd to allow *Henry*'s Body as little reſt in the Grave, as it had above Ground. Accordingly the Schiſmatical Biſhop of *Liege* (as *Cabbaſutius* calls him) could not be reſtor'd to the Communion of the Church, till he had order'd *Henry*'s Body to be digg'd up, and removed to ſome prophane Place;

for this Biſhop had commanded the Body to be privately buried, and without Ceremony, in a certain Monaſtery, from whence it was moved to *Spires*, where being put up in a Stone-Coffin, it was depoſited in unconſecrated Ground. This likewiſe was the Fate of *Guibert* Archbiſhop of *Ravenna*, and Antipope, who Five Years after his Death was, by Order of the Council of *Mentz*, digg'd up and burn'd: In which Council it was likewiſe decreed, that all Biſhops of the Emperor *Henry*'s Party who were alive ſhould be depos'd; and thoſe that were dead ſhould be digg'd up and burn'd. *Labb. T.* 10. *p.* 620.

I ask the Reader's Pardon for interrupting the Order of Time, but the Series of Hiſtory requires it, and therefore I ſhall proceed to the reſt of what paſs'd between the two *Henries* and Pope *Paſchal* II. which other interfering Matter would disjoint.

Henry V. having, *A. D.* 1106. ſent a moſt ſplendid Embaſſy to the Pope, in which he diſclaim'd all Title and Pretence to the Inveſtiture of any Holy Dignities, and promis'd eternal Obedience and Fidelity to the Supream See, deſires to be conſecrated Emperor by him. Which being agreed upon, he enters *Italy* with a vaſt Army, and *A. D.* 1111, on the 12th of *February*, he is met without the City by the Nobility and People, at the Gates by the Clergy, and at St. *Peter*'s by Pope *Paſchal*, whoſe Feet *Henry* having firſt kiſs'd, they mutually embrac'd, and enter'd the Church together. Thus to outward Appearance Things went ſwimmingly; but *Henry* was no more ſincere at this Time, than his Holineſs was afterwards; for when the Pope demanded of him to recognize his former Promiſes of Duty and Fidelity to the Supream See, and eſpecially that of reſtoring the Inveſtitures of Eccleſiaſtick Benefices to the Church, he not only re-

fuſed to perform any of theſe, but ſecures the Pope, denying to crown him, and ſeveral Cardinals, under a ſtrong Guard in his Camp, where he detain'd them One and ſixty Days, not ſparing for Threats and other Ways to humble his Supremacy; which did not fail of their deſired Effect; for *Cabbaſutius*, *p.* 402. *col.* 1. ſays, The Calamities of his Fellow-Sufferers, the Danger the City was in by *Henry*'s Army, the Schiſm which would inevitably follow, and the Importunity of his Friends, did at laſt prevail with the good Man to take an Oath never to excommunicate *Henry*, and that he would allow of all Inveſtitures granted by him; and this the other Biſhops and Cardinals that were detain'd with him were oblig'd to ſwear. In fine, an Inſtrument is extorted from Pope *Paſchal* under his Hand and Seal, allowing *Henry* to inveſt all Biſhops and Abbots, elect with the Ring and Staff, and that before their Conſecration, no other previous Inveſtiture than that of the King's ſhould be requir'd. Hereupon the Captives are enlarg'd, and *Henry* is crowned and anointed Emperor by Pope *Paſchal* II. The foremention'd Arguments for doing theſe ill Things, *viz.* The Danger and Importunity of Friends, and the City, together with the threatning Schiſm, were Calamities at a Diſtance, and only in *poſſe*, not in *eſſe*; and ſo long a good Man may hope for an intervening Providence, to avert thoſe threatning Miſchiefs; but ſuppoſe or admit the worſt actually to happen, his Infallibility was much out of the Way to make Neceſſity an Argument for juſtifying an ill Action, ſince the Scripture has given us a ſhort but golden Rule, *Not to do Evil, that Good may come of it.* *Henry* indeed did play the Part of a wicked Man, in treacherouſly decoying the Infallible Judge into ſuch a difficult Dilemma, and extorting ſuch Conceſſions from him;

him; but his Infallibility is reſolved to let him know, he can reſent like other Mortals; " For as " ſoon as the Emperor had withdrawn his Army, " and that the Pope was retired into *Campania*, " the Biſhops and Cardinals meeting at *Rome*, con- " firm'd all the Decrees made by *Gregory* VII. and " *Urban* II. againſt Lay-Inveſtitures, decreeing " likewiſe at the ſame Time, that nothing on the " contrary extorted from Pope *Paſchal* ſhould be of " any Force." *Lab. ibid.* who cites *Otho Friſingenſ. Petrus Diaconus*, and others. This would be a ſevere Reflection on the Infallibility, but that the Confeſſion of Pope *Paſchal* in the Fifth *Lateran* Council, *viz. A. D.* 1116. takes it off, ſhewing in what Capacity he took the Oath to the Emperor. " After the Lord had done what he pleaſed with his " Servant, and had deliver'd me and the *Roman* " People into the Hands of the King, Rapine, " Fire, and Sword raged every where. Being de- " ſirous therefore to avert theſe Miſchiefs from the " Church and People of God, I did what I did; " and what I did was for the Freedom of the Peo- " ple of God. But I did it as a Man, who am " but Duſt and Aſhes. I confeſs I have done " wickedly; wherefore I deſire you all to pray to " God to pardon me. But that wicked Writing " (*i. e. the Inſtrument he ſign'd*) which was done in " Camp, I condemn to a perpetual Anathema, that " it may hereafter be of no Force; and in this I " deſire you all to join with me." Thus the Editors, out of *Conrad* of *Urſperg*, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 807. But that which follows is ſo ridiculous and abſurd, that I cannot imagine for what End *Conrad* wrote it, or the Editors cite it. After the Pope had made this Confeſſion in the Council, one *Bruno*, a Biſhop, ſtands up, and ſays, " Let us thank God, who " have heard our Lord Pope *Paſchal*, who preſides

" over this Council, with his own Mouth con-
" demning that Privilege which contain'd Wicked-
" neſs and Hereſy. And then in a bantering Man-
" ner adds, If that Privilege contained Hereſy, he
" that made it was an Heretick." The very Manner of the Expreſſion ſhews it to be an intended Jeſt and Banter upon the Pope's Weakneſs; which nothing could come up to or exceed, but the Defence of *Cajetan*, a Biſhop likewiſe in this Council, who looking ſcornfully upon *Bruno*, ſaid, " Do you in Council, and in the Hearing of us
" all, call the *Roman* Pontiff Heretick? The Wri-
" ting indeed which he ſign'd was an ill Thing,
" but it was not Hereſy." And another, to mend
" the Matter, ſtands up and ſays, " Nay, it ought
" not ſo much as to be called Evil, becauſe, if to
" free the People of God be a good Thing, what
" the Pope did was good." This Perſon is not named by *Conrad*, but whatever he was in other Reſpects, I believe the Reader will join with me in this, that he had but a very ſlender Share of Skill in Logick. But he goes on: " To deliver the Peo-
" ple of God is good by the Authority of the Goſ-
" pel, in which we are commanded to lay down
" our Lives for our Brethren." 'Tis granted, but this is not to be done by Lying and Perjury. But to make an End, " The Pope's Patience began to
" be rouz'd at the horrible Name of Hereſy, and
" beckoning with his Hand for Silence, ſays, Hear
" me, Brethren, this Church never had any Here-
" ticks; for here all Hereſies are quaſh'd: Here
" the *Arian* Hereſy, which for Three hundred
" Years troubled the World, was brought to an
" End." Truly his Holineſs was but indifferently skill'd in Story; for, as has been already ſaid, the Biſhops of *Rome* had ſo little Concern in that Matter, that it is not known yet in what Pope's Reign

the

the Firſt *Nicene* Council was held, which took the greateſt Cognizance of that Hereſy. But as to his ſaying, *That the Church of* Rome *never had any Hereſy*, he is as much or more out than before; their Church could not have Hereticks without Hereſy; and for *Hereticks*, Infidels, Apoſtates, Simoniacks, *&c.* the Catalogue of Popes, in Proportion to the Number, may vie with the worſt Sort of Men, ſince God bleſs'd the World with the Chriſtian Religion. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 807, 808. There is one remarkable Paſſage at the pretended Reconciliation between the Emperor *Henry* V. and the Pope, which I have omitted in its proper Place; *viz.* That at the Ce- " lebration of Maſs, the Pope, in Confirma- " tion of the Peace, gave the Emperor the Lord's " Body, uſing theſe Words: My Lord the Empe- " ror, in Confirmation of the Peace between you " and me, I give you the Body of our Lord, who " was born of the Virgin *Mary*, and ſuffer'd on the " Croſs for us." There could not be a more ſolemn Recognition of God than in this Manner; and yet there was no Reality on either Side: For it is plain that the Emperor did not mean ſincerely towards the Pope; and on the other Hand, it's as certain that the Pope meant as fallaciouſly as the Emperor; for the foreſaid Calamities of his Fellow-Sufferers, the Danger of the City, the Schiſm, and the Importunity of Friends, ſo prevailed with the good Pope, that he took an Oath he never intended to keep. But the Editors, tho' they inſert this Story of the Pope's giving the Euchariſt to the Emperor upon this Sham-Reconciliation; yet it looking ſomewhat ludicrouſly on the Pope's Side, find it neceſſary to invalidate it, and therefore call *Sigebert*, who is the Author, a Favourer of Schiſmatick Emperors. But as to *Sigebert*, his Character is equally good with theirs, he was a Monk, and

cotemporary with the great Actors in these Affairs. He took the Part indeed of the two *Henries* againſt Pope *Gregory* VII. and his two Succeſſors, *Urban* and *Paſchal*, againſt whoſe Decrees he was a ſtrenuous Opponent; for which Cauſe *Baronius*, *Bellarmine*, *&c.* are not ſparing of Calumny. However their Malice cannot affect his Worth, and his Writings, *viz. Chronicon*, *ab An.* 381, *ad An.* 1112. his Book, *De Scriptoribus Eccleſ. &c.* make his Abilities very eminently appear to the World. But to return.

The Pope having confeſs'd and repented of his Failings, and recall'd the Conceſſions he had made about Inveſtitures to the Emperor, *&c.* the Emperor purſues the perfidious Pope, and in the Year 1117, drives him out of *Rome*; but he getting together a numerous Army of *Normans*, and having been very ſucceſsful in *Campania*, thought himſelf ſo ſecure of Victory, that he proudly and diſdainfully refuſed Abſolution to the Emperor, who in a moſt ſuppliant Manner requeſted it. The 28th of *January*, 1118. Pope *Paſchal* was forc'd to reſign the Proſecution of his Quarrel to his Succeſſor, who manag'd it with quite different Succeſs.

Among the Epiſtles of this Pope, there is one, *viz.* the 27th, to the Canons of *Aoſt*, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 653. which the Editors themſelves mark for a Forgery, and ſay, That *Baronius*, *ad An.* 1112. *n.* 25. looks upon it as a Fiction forg'd by *Conrad* Canon of *Aoſt*. Now, as this Epiſtle is by them acknowledg'd to be fictitious, any reaſonable Perſon would think it not for the Reputation of the Editors, or the Intereſt of their Cauſe, to inſert notorious Falſities, and ſuch as themſelves cannot but own to be ſo. But conſider, Forgeries, as we have already plainly made appear, were always invented to ſerve

ſerve ſome End; and this Epiſtle does not want that, for it ſpeaks very largely of the Extent of Power, and of Appeals to the Biſhop of *Rome*.

Pope *Paſchal* II. and his two great Predeceſſors *Gregory* VII. and *Urban* II. having wreſted ſo much Power out of the Hands of the Emperor and other Temporal Princes, ſoon falls upon a proper Method to fix this Power; therefore when any one was choſen Biſhop or Archbiſhop, the Apoſtolick See demanded an Oath of Fidelity and Obedience from them before they delivered them the Pall. This is very expreſs from the two Epiſtles of Pope *Paſchal* II. to the Archbiſhop of *Palermo*, and *N.* Archbiſhop of *Poland*. The Argument in both which is the ſame, and the Reſult of them both amounts to this, "That ſince they received the Enſigns of "their Dignity from the Apoſtolick See, which "were taken, as it were, from the very Hand "of St. *Peter*, it was but reaſonable that they ſhould "pay Signs of due Subjection to the Apoſtolick "See, *&c. Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 627, 628. Theſe Epiſtles are of early Date in this Pope's Pontificate, being the Fifth and Sixth in Number; which ſhews what Care he took to ſecure what his Predeceſſors had gain'd from the Temporal Prince. And his Method of diminiſhing the Imperial Majeſty, and advancing his own, cannot be better exemplified than in that cunning Inſinuation of his in his Epiſtles; the Second, Fourth, Tenth, and ſo on to the Number of at leaſt Thirty, bearing Date according to the Year of his Pontificate, and not of the Emperor, which formerly was the Cuſtom: By theſe Means extenuating the Name and Power together of the Imperial Dignity, to encroach upon which they never neglected an Opportunity.

A. D. 1106. Pope *Paſchal* II. held a Council at *Guaſtalla* in *Lombardy*, in which the chief Care of the Pope was to ſecure ſo dangerous a Rival as the Metropolis of *Ravenna* had been to the See of *Rome*, from any future Attempts. This the Pope effectually accompliſh'd in this Synod, by diveſting that Metropolis of all *Emilia*, with the Cities thereunto belonging, *viz. Placentia*, *Parma*, *Rhegium*, *Mutina*, and *Bononia*, which were never more to pay any Obedience or Subjection to the Church of *Ravenna*. The MS. of *Cencius Camerarius*, in the *Vatican*, ſpeaks the Reaſon of this very plainly. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 748. "This Metropolis, for nigh an "hundred Years, had been a proud Rival of "the Apoſtolick See; for it had not only uſurp'd "ſeveral of its Eſtates, but *Guibert*, the late Me-"tropolitan of it, had invaded the very *Roman* "Church." Here was indeed the true Cauſe of the Grievance, and which Pope *Paſchal* II. was reſolv'd to eradicate, by diſabling the Church of *Ravenna* from ever contending with that of *Rome*, in diveſting her of ſo many Cities. The Biſhops of *Rome* indeed had too ſucceſsfully encroach'd upon ſeveral Churches, and often met with ſtrong Oppoſition from ſeveral in Defence of their Rights, as has been already noted, particularly from *Hincmar* Archbiſhop of *Rhemes*, and other Parts of the *Gallican* Church, who were tenacious of their Rights, till Power prevailing, they were compell'd to Submiſſion, which cannot be call'd a canonical Proceeding. Theſe have been the Methods of the Biſhops of *Rome* advancing the Greatneſs of that See to what it now is; but it may be obſerv'd, that the ſame Exorbitances and Encroachments have diveſted her of ſeveral powerful and wealthy Kingdoms, who could no longer bear her inſufferable Pride and Inſults. For who can look upon thoſe

thoſe diabolical Practices of raiſing unnatural Commotions in Kingdoms and Empires, abſolving Subjects from their Allegiance to their lawful Princes, encouraging Children to rebel againſt and depoſe their Parents, and filling the Chriſtian World with Blood and Confuſion, and not be ſtruck with Horror and Amazement? Theſe Methods muſt needs create a juſt Jealouſy in all Churches and States; for that Body of People, whether Eccleſiaſtick or Civil, whoſe Rights are invaded, muſt be allowed to be in Danger; and when they are once depriv'd of them, I cannot think them otherwiſe than in a State of Slavery. For this Reaſon the *Gallican* Church hath ſo often ſtruggled with that of *Rome*, and was once in a fair Way of bringing the Biſhop of *Rome* to better Terms, had he not betaken himſelf to the old Method of raiſing Rebellions, ſetting Children againſt their Parents, and Subjects againſt their Sovereigns. Another Inſtance of a loyal Struggle in the *Gallican* Church was at the Council of *Anſa*, about the Buſineſs of Lay-Inveſtitures. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 786, *&c.* And *Coſſart*, in his Premonition to this Council, ſpeaks very honeſtly. "As to what concerns this Council, ſays he, we "know that there was ſuch a Council held, and "that the Biſhops of the Province of *Sens* were "called to it, but refuſed to obey. However the "Council was held, and the Archbiſhop and Biſhops "of *Sens*, in a ſynodical Epiſtle, gave Reaſons for their "abſenting." To which *John* Archbiſhop of *Lyons* writes an Anſwer. They are both valuable Monuments of Antiquity; and tho' the Archbiſhop of *Lions* ſeems to be of the Opinion of the Court of *Rome*; yet there appears in both a Strain of neat Reaſoning, and Abundance of good Manners.

A. D. 1115. A Council was held ſomewhere in *Syria*, ſome think in *Jeruſalem*, in the Caſe of *Arnulph* Patriarch thereof. If the Editors had deſign'd to throw a Scandal on Pope *Paſchal* II. they could not have pitch'd upon a more infamous Story. Let the Reader take it as they relate it from *Will. Tyrius l.* 11. *Belli Sacri, c.* 26. "At that Time the Pope "being inform'd of the enormous Converſation "of *Arnulph* Patriarch of *Jeruſalem*, he ſent the "Biſhop of *Orange*, a venerable Man, and con-"ſpicuous for his religious Life, as Legate into "thoſe Parts of *Syria*, who calling together a "Council of all the Biſhops of that Kingdom, "*Arnulph* was brought before them; where, ac-"cording to his Deſerts, he was by the Pontifi-"cal Authority deprived of his Pontifical Office. "But *Arnulph*, depending on his own Cunning, "by which he had cheated ſo many, takes Ship-"ping, and haſtens to *Rome*, where, with fair "Words and large Preſents, he ſo blinded the "Eyes of the Pope, [good Man!] and the whole "Church, that he return'd to his See in Triumph." According to this Account of *Tyrius*, the Scandal lies upon both Capacities; for ſometimes when a Blemiſh ſticks hard upon a Pope, they will tell us, that is as he is, Humane; but here the Infallibility is ſtabb'd through both Sides, for *Tyrius* ſaith, That *Arnulph* not only cheated the Pope, but the whole Church too, with his Golden Rhetorick. Theſe juggling Diſtinctions, and double Capacities, have been of dangerous Conſequence to Kings, whoſe Subjects from thence, no Doubt, have ſuck'd the Notion of murde ing the Perſonal to preſerve the Politick Capacity. But the End of *Tyrius*'s Account is yet more ſcandalous, for he ſays, "*Arnulph*, through the Favour of the Apoſtolick "See, returning Home, repoſſeſſes the See of *Je-*

"*ruſa-*

" *ruſalem*, with Licence to live after the ſame Man-
" ner which drew on his Depoſition." From hence we may juſtly infer, that *Arnulph* had by his Bribes not only inſinuated into the Pope and Church's Favour, ſo as to gain a Pardon for Crimes paſt, but a Diſpenſation to repeat the ſame for the Time to come. Why, as has been ſaid before, the Editors ſhould inſert improbable Forgeries, fabulous Antiquities, Stories that have not the leaſt Weight of Truth in them, and ſcandalous Narratives, which ſerve but to enervate their Cauſe, and blacken inſtead of brightening the Characters of thoſe they would illuſtrate, is paſt my Conception, unleſs it be for the Sake of thoſe racy Touches and Innuendo's of Univerſality. And truly this Encroachment of the Patriarch of *Rome* over him of *Jeruſalem*, is as large a Step Eaſtward, as any of them had made Weſtward: But how ſcandalous a one I need not deſcant on, it tells it ſelf.

A. D. 1116. Pope *Paſchal* calls a Council at *Rome* upon a very ſlight Occaſion, *viz.* that of Prerogative between the two Abbots of *Cluny* and *Caſſino*; the former calling himſelf *Abbot of Abbots*, tho' the Title was confer'd on the latter, *Caſſino* being the Spring of the Monaſtick State, and from which all Monks received the Rule of St. *Benedict*. This was an Arrogance undoubtedly aſſum'd by the Abbots in Imitation of the *Servus Servorum Dei*, that lords it over all he can; and therefore no Wonder to hear it confirm'd by him. Had an Orthodox Biſhop, or a Secular Prieſt, offer'd at ſuch an Innovation, he had met with a different Uſage, and been incapacitated for ever aſpiring again. This Sentence, which was pronounc'd in Favour of the Abbey of *Caſſino*, was done by *John* the Chancellor of *Rome*, who was bred up a Monk there; and therefore might be ſuppoſed to declare in Favour

vour of the Place of his Education. Tho' considering his Station then, and the Prospect of Advancement, his being a Favourite of Pope *Urban* II. who made him Chancellor of the *Roman* Church, and of Pope *Paschal* II. who made him Cardinal Deacon of St. *Mary's in Cosmedin*; I say, considering these Things, we need not wonder at his encouraging an ambitious Innovation in the Title of *Abbot of Abbots* in another, when himself could not but have a Prospect of the highest Pitch of Honour in the Church, tho' under the Title of *Servant of Servants*; his Intimacy with the two foresaid Popes, especially Pope *Paschal* II. was a sure Recommendation, according to the Editors: *In Ecclesia Romana semper irreprehensibiliter Paschali Pontifici collaboraverit*: "He serv'd Pope *Paschal* so "obligingly in the *Roman* Church, that he could not "be found Fault with." *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 813. This accordingly came to pass, for in Thirteen Days after the Death of Pope *Paschal*, he is chosen Pope at *Rome* by the Name of

[1118.] *Gelasius* II. and consecrated at *Gaietta* the 24th of *February* following. His Reign was short, and full of Tumult and Noise, most unheard of Barbarities being committed on both Sides; especially on the Emperor's Side, whose Partisans practic'd all the Cruelty imaginable on their Opposers. After various Attempts and Disappointments, Pope *Gelasius* retires into *France*, the *usual Asylum of distress'd Popes*, says *Cabbasutius*, *p.* 402. *col.* 2. where within a Year he died in the Monastery of *Cluny*. His Successor

[1119.] Pope *Calistus* II. formerly called *Guido*, was a Man of a different Spirit: He was well descended, claiming Kin with the Emperor of *Germany*, and Kings of *England* and *France*, very skilful in Secular Affairs, and well read in Ecclesiasticks:

Which recommended him to the Choice of thoſe Cardinals that with Pope *Gelaſius* took Sanctuary at *Cluny*; where, on the 4th of *February*, he was choſen, and the *March* following crown'd in the ſame Place. He was as active as politick; and therefore, not to loſe Time, he calls a Council at *Rhemes*, where he revives the Quarrel of his Predeceſſors, in condemning the Claim of Lay-Inveſtitures, Simony, and the Marriage of the Clergy: At the ſame Time excommunicating the Emperor *Henry* V. *Burdinus* the Antipope, and their Adherents. This was in *November*; and the Beginning of the next Year he marches into *Italy*, where being receiv'd with great Applauſe, and Concourſe of much People, *Burdinus* was ſo terrified, that he left *Rome*, and fled to *Sutrium*, where he fortified himſelf. Thither *Caliſtus* purſues and beſieges him; where in a ſhort Time a Battle is fought between theſe Two military Prelates, and *Burdinus* loſt the Day, was taken Priſoner, and uſed very ſcurvily; for being cover'd with a Sheep-Skin, he was ſet on a Camel's Back, with his Face to the Tail, which he held in his Hand inſtead of a Bridle. [Note, That this Pope did not hold the Tail in his Hands after they were cut off, as ſome of his Predeceſſors aforeſaid did.] And being thus expos'd to the Malice and Ridicule of the People, he was ſhut up in the Monaſtry of *Cava*, and condemn'd to perpetual Impriſonment and Pennance.

The ſame Month and Year that the Council of *Rhemes* was held by Pope *Caliſtus*, *Goisfred* Archbiſhop of *Rouen* in *Normandy*, returning from *Rhemes*, call'd a Council at *Rouen*. Among the reſt of the Acts of this Council, he, under Pain of Excommunication, forbid any of his Presbyters to have any Converſation with Women; which was one of the Canons of the Council of *Rhemes*. The Cler-

gy

gy look upon this as an Oppreſſion and Innovation; whereupon the Archbiſhop orders one *Albert*, an eloquent Man, as he was going to ſpeak, to be apprehended, and caſt into Priſon. This Archbiſhop, according to *Orderic. Vitalis Eccleſ. Hiſt. l.* 12. our Countryman, was a very raſh, imprudent Man, paſſionate, and impatient of any Oppoſition. The reſt of the Prieſts being ſurpriz'd at this unuſual Treatment, to ſee an innocent Man, without Examination, or Charge of Guilt, hurried out of the Church to Priſon like a Thief, were in Diſpute whether to defend themſelves or to fly. In ſhort, this ended in a diſorderly Tumult, much Miſchief being done on both Sides: But I do not find that the Archbiſhop gain'd his Point; and if he did, it was an odd Way of propagating by Force.

A. D 1122, in the Month of *March*, a Council was call'd at *Rome*, in which *Oderiſius* Abbot of *Caſſino* was conſecrated, where the Monks behav'd themſelves ſo proudly, that the Biſhops, provok'd by their arrogant and ſaucy Carriage, complain'd in Council of them; ſaying, That they were arriv'd to that Height now, that there remain'd nothing but to lay aſide their Ring and Croſier, and wait on them: For they had Villages, Churches, Tythes, Oblations of Living and Dead. And then, turning to the Pope, they ſaid, The Religion and Honour of the Clergy is ſunk and periſhed, whilſt the Monks, forgetting their Vows, inſatiably encroach on the Rights of the Biſhops, and hunt after their Poſſeſſions: That they, who had left the World, and all the Deſires of it, did not ceaſe moſt greedily to purſue worldly Gain; and quitting their quiet Retreat provided by their Founder St. *Bennet*, were buſied in nothing ſo much as ſeizing on the Epiſcopal Rights. The Monks were

were not behind-hand in their Defence, urging that they ceas'd not Night and Day to implore the Mercy of God for the Salvation of the whole World: And what would become of them if the Holy Sanctions of the Popes ſhould be violated? Nor had the Abbots of *Caſſino* deſerved ſo ill of the Apoſtolick See, that in this Pontificate they ſhould looſe what ſo many Emperors, Kings, Dukes, and *Roman* Biſhops, had offered to St. *Bennet*. After this, the Biſhop of *Liguria* ſtood up, and, in Behalf of the Monaſtick State, urg'd, That whatever the Biſhops might ſay of the Monks, yet it was upon juſt Ground, that our Predeceſſors founded and enriched Monaſteries: For in the Infancy of the Church there were Two Orders inſtituted; one, which labour'd in the Word and Preaching; the other, which continued in Prayer: One, which led an active, the other, a contemplative Life. At laſt, to put an End to the Diſpute, the Pope commanding Silence, declared thus in Favour of the Monks, though againſt his own Order: "The "Church of *Caſſino* was not founded by Man, but "by Jeſus Chriſt; to whoſe Government the Ho-"ly Father *Bennet* reſtor'd it, purging it from Idols, "and making it eminent throughout the World "for its Holy Rule, Miracles, and his own corpo-"ral *Requiem*, and conſtituting it the Head of the "Monaſtick Order. The ſame venerable Place "has been repair'd and rebuilt by ſeveral *Roman* "Pontiffs, and hath prov'd a ſafe Retreat for the "Sons of the *Roman* Church both in Proſperity "and Adverſity. Therefore, in Imitation of our "Holy Predeceſſors, we decree, That the Mona-"ſtery of *Caſſino* be for ever free from all Subje-"ction, and continue under the Protection and "Defence of the *Roman* Church only: But for "other Monaſteries, they were to remain in the

"ſame

" ſame Order they were founded." Which, conſidering the many Privileges and Immunities they were all endowed with at firſt, were large enough, none of them paying any Subjection to the Biſhop of the Dioceſe they live in, though oblig'd by many Canons to it. This Determination of the Biſhop of *Rome*, in Favour of the Monks, and in Oppoſition to his own Order, was ſcandalous and baſe; nay, the Editors plainly tell us the ill Uſe the Monks made of it, for as ſoon as the Abbot had finiſhed his Affairs at *Rome*, he returned to his Monaſtery, and was received by all the Brethren in a moſt ſolemn and magnificent Proceſſion. Of all this, ſee *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 888, 889.

The ſame Year a Council was call'd at *Worms*, in which the Caſe of Inveſtitures, which had laſted about Fifty Years, was ended; the Emperor for his Part delivering up all Claim and Pretenſion to any: The Pope on his Side conceding, That all Elections of Biſhops and Abbots in the Teutonick Dominions ſhould be made in the Preſence of the Emperor, without Simony or Violence; and that if any Diſcord ſhould ariſe, the Emperor with his Power ſhould aſſiſt the honeſt Party with the Council and Judgment of the Metropolitan and his Biſhops; but that the Perſon elected ſhould receive his *Regalia* from the Emperor, except in thoſe which belong to the Church of *Rome*.

There is one Paſſage which the Editors take Notice of in the Council of *Rhemes*, juſt now mention'd, from *Eadmer* the Monk, *Hiſtor. l.* 5. and which anſwers no End, but to expoſe Pope *Caliſtus* II. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 878. The Story is thus: " *Thurſtan* Archbiſhop of *York* Elect would not pay " that Submiſſion to the See of *Canterbury* which " was demanded, and indeed was his Duty. Up- " on which, *Henry* I. King of *England* eſpouſes " the

" the Intereſt of the See of *Canterbury*, refuſing to
" give Leave to *Thurſtan* to aſſiſt at the Council of
" *Rhemes*, till he had promiſed that he would not
" receive Epiſcopal Benediction from the Pope.
" But before this, ſays *Eadmer*, *ibid.* the King ſent
" a Meſſenger to the Pope, informing him of the
" Occaſion of the Difference between the Arch-
" biſhops of *Canterbury* and *York*; obliging him
" not to conſecrate *Thurſtan* himſelf, nor ſuffer
" him to be conſecrated by any but the Archbiſhop
" of *Canterbury*, as the Cuſtom was; for if he did,
" he would not allow him to ſet Foot in any Part
" of his Dominion. And if his Holineſs, by Ver-
" tue of his Apoſtolick Authority, ſhould oppoſe
" him in this, he would perſiſt in his Reſolution to
" the Loſs of his Crown. The Pope replies, He
" would not have the King think he intended to
" do any Thing againſt his Inclination: [A pious
" Reſerve, conſidering his Actions in this Affair.]
" For it never was in his Thoughts to act againſt
" the Dignity of the See of *Canterbury*, over which
" ſo many eminent Fathers had preſided. The
" credulous Meſſenger, believing the Profeſſions
" of the Apoſtolick Father, thought himſelf ſe-
" cure in his Embaſſy: Till coming to *Rhemes*, he,
" not without great Surprize, found Archbiſhop
" *Thurſtan* and others prepared to receive the Apo-
" ſtolick Benediction. But the Truth appearing
" beyond Doubt or Contradiction, *John*, the Arch-
" deacon of *Canterbury*, to whoſe Management
" this Affair was intruſted, ſtood up in the Pre-
" ſence of the Pope and the other Biſhops, and
" loudly declared againſt the Injuſtice done to the
" See of *Canterbury*; and that though he was Pope,
" he could not juſtify his depriving the See of *Can-
" terbury* of her Rights, which had never denied
" her Duty to any where it was due. To this the

" Pope anſwer'd, That he would do nothing in " Prejudice of the Church of *Canterbury*; but ſa- " ving her Dignity and Right, ſhould purſue his " Purpoſe. This ſtruck the Aſſembly with Amaze- " ment, eſpecially when they ſaw the Pope act " ſo apparent an Injuſtice: For he conſecrated " *Thurſtan* Archbiſhop of *York*; thereby defrauding " his Lord of his Allegiance, to whom (under " God) it was due. The Pope having ſummon'd " ſeveral Biſhops to attend at this Conſecration, " *Hubald* Biſhop of *Lyons* could by no Means be " perſuaded to be preſent at it, as plainly perce- " ving Things went not right, and abhorring the " Injuſtice offer'd to the See of *Canterbury*. As " for the Biſhops of *England*, who were order'd by " the King's Special Command to attend here, " they were not yet arriv'd, ſo that they were ig- " norant of what had paſs'd in this Affair. But " as ſoon as the King knew of it, he forbad *Thur-* " *ſtan*, or any of his Aſſociates, to return into " *Normandy*, *England*, or any Part of his Domi- " nions." I ask Pardon for being ſo particular, and conſequently tedious, in this Tranſaction; but the Truth requires it: For the Pope, who was chief Manager in this Affair, ſupported a Suffragan againſt his Metropolitan, and his King too; whom notwithſtanding he diſobey'd, and went to the Council of *Rhemes*, againſt his poſitive Orders to the contrary. The King dealt fairly and aboveboard with the Pope, and requeſted him not to do any Thing in Prejudice of the See of *Canterbury*: But the Pope acted very diſingenuouſly with the King; for after he had promiſed him to do nothing in this Affair againſt his Inclinations, or in Prejudice of the See of *Canterbury*, he perfidiouſly breaks his Word in both, by conſecrating *Thurſtan* Archbiſhop of *York*. This was look'd upon as ſo

black a Piece of Perfidy, that *Hubald*, the good Archbiſhop of *Lyons*, could by no Perſwaſions or Commands be induced to be preſent at this Conſecration, eſteeming it an unjuſt Violation of the Rights of the See of *Canterbury*; beſides the Scandal in perfidiouſly breaking his Word.

A. D. 1123, the Sixth Lateran and Firſt General Council of this Century was held at *Rome*; wherein the Conditions of Peace between the Emperor and the Pope, made the Year before at the Council of *Worms*, about Inveſtitures, are confirmed, and the Emperor and his Adherents abſolved from the Cenſures of the Church, and the Acts of the Antipope, *Gregory* VIII. reſcinded. There were likewiſe Twenty two Canons relating to Eccleſiaſtick Diſcipline made in this Council, moſt of which are taken from the Council of *Claromont*, under Pope *Urban* II. *A. D.* 1095. The Eleventh Canon of this Council is in Subſtance the ſame with the Second of the Council of *Claromont*; but the Eleventh here is more particular. The Second of *Claromont* ſays, "Whoſoever ſhall "take a Journey to *Jeruſalem* to ſerve the Church, "[*i. e.* in War,] that Journey ſhall be reckon'd to "him for a general Pennance." *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 507. But the Eleventh of this *Lateran* Council is much more full, and ſeems to be explanatory of the Second of *Claromont*, becauſe it mentions Pope *Urban*, *viz.* "They who go to *Jeruſalem* to defend "the Chriſtians, and oppoſe the Infidels, SHALL "RECEIVE A PARDON OF ALL THEIR "SINS; and their Houſes, Families, and Goods, "ſhall remain under the Protection of St. *Peter*, "and the *Roman* Church, according to the Decree "of the Holy Father, Pope *Urban*." This Canon is a plain Illuſtration of the former; and ſhews, That Pope *Calliſtus* II. was very ready to aſſert

what his Predeceſſor, Pope *Urban* II. had ſo advantagiouſly ſtarted; for *Urban* II. was the Firſt Biſhop of *Rome* that aſſumed this particular Branch of Power; (though it may be included in their Univerſal Supremacy.) This is plain from *Stephen Baluzius*, who, in his Notes on the latter Part of this Canon, on another Occaſion, calls Pope *Urban* II. *Belli ſacri in Oriente gerundi Autor: The Beginner of the Holy War in the Eaſt*; affirming the ſame Practice in his Succeſſors, *viz.* who gave the ſame Indulgence of Sins to thoſe that went againſt the *Saracens* in *Spain*. *Ibid. p.* 900. Here they pretend Authority for their Practice, which immediately form'd it into a Cuſtom, which ſoon becomes as prevalent as a Law. But the Profitableneſs of this, I believe, advanc'd it beyond any Thing: And that Man that can be deluded into the Belief of ſo extenſive a Power of Forgiving, no Doubt, will give largely at his Death for the Security of his Soul: (And a happy Compoſition too, if it could be!) Thus came in Indulgences; from whence ſpawn'd perſonal Merit, and many other profitable Appendages to both; of which the Biſhop and Court of *Rome* are ſtill tenacious. *Cabbaſutius*, *p.* 399. talks very formally of this Canon; and, I think, more than he can prove: For firſt he ſays, that formerly Penitents were refuſed going to the Wars; for which he ſhews his Authority from one of Pope *Siricius*'s Epiſtles: But of what Force thoſe Epiſtles are with the Judicious, let the Reader look back to the Year 385, and he will ſoon be ſatisfied. But granting this to have been ſo, he tells us: "That nevertheleſs the Eaſtern Expedition ſo "ſway'd with the Fathers of the Council of *Claromont*, and other ſucceeding Councils, that "they look'd upon the delivering the Chriſtians "of *Paleſtine* from the Tyranny of the Mahome-

"tans

" tans to be of very great Moment; and that the " innumerable Hazards, Fatigues, and Expence, " both of Blood and Treaſure, which attended " that diſtant War, ſeem'd to exceed the Severity " of uſual Pennances; ſo that this Way of Com- " muting might expiate what Sins ſoever more ſuf- " ficiently than any Canonical Puniſhment." *Cabaſutius* indeed has put as plauſible a Gloſs on the Matter as it is capable of: But, with Submiſſion, I think a ſhameful Conviction of Sin, a hearty Sorrow and pungent Contrition for it, and an aggravating Confeſſion of it in all its unhappy Circumſtances, is a Puniſhment (if duly ſubmitted to) far exceeding all Temporal Inflictions; and no Puniſhment like a Canonical Pennance, conſciencioufly enjoin'd and perform'd. If hard Campaigns in a Foreign Land, immenſe Treaſures, and Seas of Blood, were to commute for Crimes, the vileſt and moſt unnatural Sins have been atton'd for in later Days. But to return: Whatever the Deſign of Pope *Urban* II. and *Caliſtus* II. might be in propoſing this Commutation of Perſonal Service for Canonical Pennance, it's certain it introduced the Grant of Indulgences on other Occaſions for any Term of Years. And thus one of the moſt profitable Parts of their Income commenc'd upon a falſe Ground, and has continued ſo ever ſince.

[1124.] Pope *Honorius* II. before call'd *Lambert*, is, according to the Editors, moſt improperly inſerted in the Catalogue of Popes; for in Right he was the Schiſmatick Intruder upon *Theobald*, or, as ſome will have him, *Theodulph*, who was canonically choſen. However, as the Editors tell us from the *Caſſinian* Chronicle, *Honorius*'s Party being the ſtronger, the Favourers of *Theobald* came over to him; ſo that Strength and Number carries the

Day. *Conrad. Urſperg.* tells the Story with much Plauſibility their Way; but *Tyrius in Bell. Sacr. l.* 13. *c.* 15. tells it another Way: And notwithſtanding what *Labbé*, or any of the Editors, may ſay of their *Incomparable Treaſure*, *Conrad*, or any other of their Creatures, very few, if any, deſerve that *Encomium Voſſius* gives of this good Man, *viz. That he was modeſt, prudent, of a penetrating Judgment, a ſincere Lover of Truth, and (conſidering the Age he liv'd in) learned and elegant.* De Hiſt. Lat. l. 2. c. 53. *Tyrius*'s Words are theſe: "Pope *Caliſtus* II. being "dead, one *Lambert*, by Country a *Bononian*, and "Biſhop of *Oſtia*, is ſubſtituted in his Room by "the Name of *Honorius*. This Election was not "without Contention with one *Theobald*, Cardi-"nal-Prieſt of *Anaſtaſia*. And becauſe this Ele-"ction of *Honorius* look'd uncanonically, [*minùs "canonicè*] after Twelve Days he laid down his "Mitre and Mantle in the Preſence of his Bre-"thren." His thus diveſting himſelf of the *Regalia*, argued an irregular uncanonical Proceeding in the Election. But then the old Salvo heals all. "The Brethren, as well Biſhops, as Prieſts and "Cardinal-Deacons, obſerving his Humility, "[though Craft and Ambition had been more "proper Terms,] and willing to prevent any In-"novation in the *Roman* Church, reſolved to a-"mend what they had raſhly before done, and "therefore afreſh recognize Pope *Honorius*, and "pay him the uſual Obedience, as Paſtor and "Univerſal Father." Thus *Tyrius*; that is, they elected him anew, and ſo ſet all right again. This, as has been already obſerved, is not the firſt Time of playing this Game. But if ſuch an Election at this be allowed, they may as well ſay, Reconciliation may be made without Satisfaction.

[1130.] *Inno-*

[1130.] *Innocent* II. before call'd *Gregory*, next aſcends the Chair. He was a Man of Family, born in *Rome*, bred a Monk in the Lateran, afterwards Abbot of the Monaſtry of St. *Nicolas* and *Benedict*. By *Urban* II. he was made Cardinal-Deacon of St. *Angelo*, *A. D.* 1118. He followed Pope *Caliſtus* II. when he fled into *France*. This was, no Doubt, a great Inducement, as ſome of his late Predeceſſors found, of his Advancement to the Pontificate, their ſharing the Fortune of the exil'd Pope endearing and recommending them. However it was, this *Gregory* is by the Name of *Innocent* II. elected Pope in the Room of *Honorius* II. on the 17th of *February*, 1130. At the ſame Time, another Party of Cardinals choſe one *Peter Leo*, a Cardinal likewiſe, by the Name of *Anaclete* II. Which of theſe Two Parties was the Major, the Editors cannot make out. If the Election of the Biſhop of *Rome* at this Time was, as formerly, by the Clergy and People of *Rome*, then, according to *Cabbaſutius*, *p.* 403. *col.* 1. *Innocent* II. was the Antipope; for he was choſen by the *ſanior Pars Cardinalium*, and that too before the Death of Pope *Honorius* was publiſhed. But the others, *qui nec moniti nec vocati fuerant*; "who had neither Notice, "nor were call'd, [a very unfair Way of proceeding in an Election] the ſame Day they knew of "the Death of the Pope, repair'd to St. *Mark*'s, "where, in a publick Concourſe of Biſhops, Cardinals, and other of the Clergy and Nobility "of *Rome*, they unanimouſly choſe *Peter Leo*, Cardinal of St. *Mary*'s, Pope." Theſe are *Cabbaſutius*'s own Words; I am ſure I do not wrong him in the Verſion. What greater Violation of Privilege can there be than this? If *Innocent*'s Election muſt be allowed to be valid, then it is plain that the College of Cardinals had ſubverted the old re-

gular Way of Electing, which was by the Clergy and People; and *Anaclete*'s Election, according to *Cabbaſutius*, was more juſt, he being choſen by the Biſhops, Cardinals, and People of *Rome*. The Editors indeed would make *Innocent*'s Election appear more plauſible, by ſaying, That he was choſen *potiſſimorum Cardinalium Voto: By the Chief of the Cardinals*. Lab. T. 10. p. 945. This may be indeed, and yet the Election in it ſelf undue; for *Innocent*'s having the Chief does not imply a Majority, which alone carries an Election. And tho' a few Lines after they ſay, That *Anaclete* was choſen by a few of the Cardinals, (leaving out the reſt of the Clergy and People) this yet does not make *Innocent*'s Election the clearer; for they muſt either give up the ancient Cuſtom of Electing by Clergy and People, and ſo admit this Encroachment of the Cardinals, or elſe *Anaclete*'s Election will appear not only more plauſible, but more juſt, and prove *Innocent* the Antipope; which has too often been the Caſe of the Editors, and many of their Authors, in placing Schiſm on the wrong Party. I would not make Uſe of the Argument of Majority, but that it was in *Anaclete*'s Caſe the moſt clear, according to their Champion *Cabbaſutius*: His Election was not by the Mob, or inferior Sort of People, but his Number was compos'd of Biſhops, Cardinals, and other Clergy, with the Nobility of *Rome*. Beſides, *Cabbaſutius*, *p.* 403. *col.* 2. in the Characters of theſe Candidates, ſays, "That *Innocent* was much inferior to his Rival *Anaclete*, who outſhin'd him in Nobility, Wealth, and Popularity, both among the Quality and common People." So that, all conſider'd, an eaſy Inference might be made in Favour of *Anaclete*, from the Editors and *Cabbaſutius*'s own Words.

Both Elections being over, *Anaclete* drives *Innocent* out of *Rome*, and excommunicates him; each thundring *Anathema's* againſt the other with the higheſt Reſentment imaginable. *Innocent* retires to *France*, the old *Aſylum* of diſtreſſed Popes, where he is received, and by the *French*, *Engliſh*, and *Germans*, acknowledged for lawful and rightful Biſhop of *Rome*, which in the Year 1131, is confirmed in the Council of *Rhemes*. *A. D.* 1133, the Emperor *Lotharius* reſtores *Innocent* to *Rome*, where *Anaclete* notwithſtanding keeps his Ground, and obſtinately ſtruggles for the Papacy with his Rival *Innocent*, till Death put an End to the Quarrel between them Two, which had laſted Eight Years. The Editors and *Cabbaſutius* agree in the Story of Pope *Innocent's* refuſing the Right of Inveſtitures to the Emperor *Lotharius*. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 945. *Cab. p.* 404. But if we conſider the Time and Occaſion, it's ſcarcely within the Verge of Probability, that the Pope ſhould or durſt refuſe the Emperor *Lotharius* any Thing. As to the Time when they ſay *Lotharius* requeſted this of the Pope, it was in the Year 1132, being the Year before the Emperor reſtor'd *Innocent*; who at that Time was in Exile, and ſolliciting for Aid to facilitate his Return: At this Time, and in a Council, *viz.* that of *Liege*, in a mighty Concourſe of Clergy and Nobility, it was, that the Emperor *Lotharius* demanded theſe Inveſtitures of Biſhopricks, *&c.* which had, to the great Detriment of the Empire, been ſeparated from it. This ſo ſtartled and amazed the *Romans*, that they began to be more apprehenſive of Danger here than what they dreaded at *Rome*. The whole Aſſembly was ſo ſurpriz'd, that they could not tell what to do; till St. *Bernard* ſtood up, who very briskly oppos'd the Emperor; and by the great Influence he had over him, wrought him into better Temper.

Temper. *Ib. p.* 916, 980. This is ſo far from being a Proof that the Pope refuſed the Emperor his Demand, that the Editors themſelves, in the very Paſſage they cite, confirm the contrary, and make it plainly appear, that the Pope did part with Inveſtitures, at leaſt in Part; Witneſs the Grant of this Pope, of the Inveſtiture of the Counteſs *Mathilda*'s Lands to *Lotharius*, and likewiſe the Epiſtle of this Pope to the Emperor and Empreſs, both dated at *Rome*. Nor do the *Salvo's* at the End of the Epiſtle any Way detract from the Right of Inveſtiture; for *Lotharius* is by Pope *Innocent* II. inveſted with the Ring, paying the Sum of 100 *l. per Ann.* to the Pope and his Succeſſors. They rail moſt unmercifully againſt *Petrus Diacon.* becauſe in *Chron. Caſſin. l.* 4. *c.* 99. he tells us, "That the "Pope entring *Germany*, he is received by the Em-"peror near *Liege*; on whom he beſtowed the "Lands of the Counteſs *Mathilda*, confirming the "Grant with the Ring and Staff. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 988. This they moſt furiouſly condemn, calling him Lyar, and Traducer of the Catholick Father, *Innocent* II. urging the Improbability of the Thing, which they ſay, according to *Peter*, was done at *Liege*; whereas the Grant it ſelf bears Date at *Rome*. This may be; nay, I believe it, *viz.* that the Grant was dated at *Rome*, and yet the Thing granted was given in the Council of *Liege*; it being a common Thing, for Inſtruments of this Nature to be made and dated in Places diſtant from whence the Grants were firſt made. But notwithſtanding they deny this Story of Inveſtitures in general, yet they own it in Part, by acknowledging the *Diploma* of the Pope for the Inveſtiture of the Counteſs *Mathilda*'s Lands in the Emperor *Lotharius*. And truly they muſt be Poſſeſſors of a moſt obdurate Front to deny what is ſo expreſly mention'd in the Second

Epiſtle

Epiſtle of this Pope. *Ib. p.* 946. But before we part with this Affair of Inveſtitures, the forementioned St. *Bernard*, who oppoſed the Emperor in this Caſe, muſt not be paſs'd over ſo ſlightly. His Character was ſo bright, that the Editors could not have fixed upon a more conſiderable Man in that Age to have adorn'd their Cauſe; and yet what they introduce him to aſſert in their Behalf is no more than this: *Audacter reſiſtens Regi, Verbum malignum mirâ Libertate redarguit, mirâ Auctoritate compeſcuit.* Which amounts to no more than this, *viz.* "That "he brought the King into better Temper:" Which might be, and yet not relinquiſh his Claim of Inveſtitures, which theſe Words cannot be ſaid to imply. But St. *Bernard*'s Character, they think, would give a Varniſh to any Thing they ſhould prefix his Name to; and for that Reaſon they introduce him, though to no real Purpoſe. He was the Glory of the Age he liv'd in, being a Man of admirable Piety and Learning, a ſtrenuous Promoter of the Church's Intereſt, and Reſtorer of her Peace; for it was he that put an End to a long and flagrant Schiſm, by prevailing with *Victor* the Antipope to ſubmit to *Innocent*. I need not, to enhance the Value of this good Man, deſcribe him in his publick Capacity, in which he perform'd Wonders. He was, in ſhort, a polite Humaniſt, a profound Theologiſt, and elegant and learned beyond the Capacity of the Age he liv'd in. So ſagacious a Man in publick Affairs could not be blinded as to private ones; and therefore the Editors did very little conſult their Advantage, in bringing in this good Man to grace their Pretenſions; for he ſaw and lamented the Errors of the Church of *Rome*, and bravely attempted a Reformation of them; as appears in his 290th Epiſtle, *A. D.* 1151, to the Cardinal-Biſhop of *Oſtia*; wherein,

in, after he had deplor'd the degenerate State of the Church, and the profligate Morals of a certain Legate of the Pope's, he adds: "Read these Letters to my Lord, [the Pope] he will consider what ought to be done with such a Man. I have discharged my Duty; yet I speak with the same Zeal I was wont. It is good for him to purge his own Court, if he would discharge his Conscience." Such a Man as this, if the Editors had consider'd his Character truly, cannot be supposed to favour Innovations, Encroachments, or Fictions. The Fourth Epistle of this Pope to *William* Patriarch of *Jerusalem*, shews a faint Struggling for the expiring Rights of that Patriarchate, but in vain; for Pope *Innocent* in a most magisterial Way chastises Patriarch *William*, for presuming to hinder or prevent *Fulcher* Archbishop of *Tyre* from taking his Pall from the Bishop of *Rome*; and yet *Tyre* was never reckon'd within the Patriarchate or Cognizance of *Rome*, or her Bishop: However, he charges Patriarch *William*, by Vertue of his Apostolical Authority, no Way to molest or disturb *Fulcher* in any Thing, but to assist and help him, and within Forty Days after the Receipt of this Epistle to do him plenary Justice in the Complaint laid before him; otherwise let him look to it, for he would withdraw *Fulcher* and his Suffragans from their Obedience to the Patriarchate of *Jerusalem*. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 949. This is tyrannical indeed; for he owns, That the Patriarch of *Jerusalem* had a Right to the Obedience of the Archbishop of *Tyre*, and his Suffragans; yet he first encourages him to take up his Pall at *Rome*, and threatens the Patriarch of *Jerusalem* for offering to hinder him; and afterwards threatens to make the Archbishop of *Tyre* and his Suffragans withdraw their Obedience from their lawful Patriarch.

The

The domineering Power which the Biſhop of *Rome* at this Time aſſumed over the Patriarch of *Jeruſalem*, and other Eaſtern Patriarchs and Biſhops, is grounded upon the old Topick of Univerſality, dated from St. *Peter* and Evangelical Authority; tho' it is beyond Diſpute, that the Goſpel ſays not a Word of it, neither did St. *Peter* ever act any Thing like it. There cannot be a higher Profanation of Sacred Writ, than to cite it in Confirmation of a Falſity, which this Pope does in the Beginning of this very Epiſtle: *Magiſterium totius Eccleſiæ & Eccleſiaſticæ Inſtitutionis beato Petro Apoſtolorum Principi cæleſti Privilegio eſſe collatum, Evangelica declarat Auctoritas. ib. p.* 948. *That the Dominion of the whole Church, and Eccleſiaſtical Affairs, was confer'd on St.* Peter, *the Prince of the Apoſtles by Divine Authority, the Goſpel declares.* Where this is to be found, let them declare if they can; I am ſure the contrary is to be prov'd from holy Scripture, which never yet was known to contradict it ſelf. The Four Evangeliſts agree in this, That our Bleſſed Lord, when he choſe his Diſciples, firſt choſe *Peter*, *Mat.* 4. 18. *Mark* 1. 16. *Luke* 5. 10. *John* 1. 42. but not one of them ſays a Word of his being inveſted with the Univerſal Juriſdiction they ſince have claim'd. But the cleareſt Proof of all in this Caſe is the Council of *Jeruſalem*, which we read of in the *Acts*, Chap. 15. where, after St. *Paul*, *Barnabas*, and *Peter* himſelf had deliver'd their Sentiments of the Controverſy in Hand, St. *James*, as Biſhop of the Place, pronounc'd the peremptory decretal Sentence, *v.* 19, 20. to which the whole Council unanimouſly conſented, *v.* 22. no one in it aſſuming a ſuperior Right to St. *James*, who as formally preſided in this Council, as any Biſhop ever did in any other ſince. And here, I think, it cannot be counted unfair to fight the Editors with their own Weapons, and

that

that is their Forgeries: For they, as has been often hinted, when Occaſion offers, ſpare not to produce Forgeries, and ſuch as themſelves have mark'd for Fictions, in Teſtimony of conſiderable Points. I deſire Pardon for this Digreſſion, which may be allow'd to be entertaining, if not inſtructing. The fore-mentioned Epiſtle of Pope *Innocent* II. aſſumes an Univerſal Supremacy, even over *Jeruſalem* it ſelf. And yet St. *Clement*'s Firſt Epiſtle is directed to James *the Biſhop of Biſhops, ruling the* Hebrew *Church at* Jeruſalem, *and all the Churches every where founded by Divine Providence. Lab. T.* 1. *p.* 82. *Bin. p.* 27. This was a great Overſight in the Forger of this Epiſtle, for certainly the Title of *Biſhop of Biſhops* was much ſuperior to that affectatious Humility in the Title of *Servus Servorum Dei.* But then giving ſuch a plenary Power in the other Part of the Direction of this Epiſtle, as *Ruler of the* Hebrew *Church at* Jeruſalem, *and all the Churches every where,* &c. was ſuch a Contradiction to the *Roman Univerſality,* as they cannot recall. There was indeed a great deal of Reaſon for an extraordinary Compliment to the Biſhop of *Jeruſalem,* who, beſides his other rare Endowments and Qualifications, was called the Brother of our Lord, being the Son of *Joſeph* by a former Wife; but whatever other Deſign the Forger of this Epiſtle of St. *Clement*'s might have, it is plain he had no Thoughts of veſting the Univerſal Supremacy in the Biſhop of *Rome,* tho' *Bellarmine, de Rom. Pont. l.* 2. *c.* 14. does: For it is moſt certain, that tho' St. *Peter* was at *Rome,* and laid the Foundation of the Church there, (which I readily grant) yet, that he held the Pontifical Chair 25 Years, as the *Romaniſts* affirm, I cannot be induc'd to believe; for, to avoid the Tediouſneſs of being particular, which is eaſily to be prov'd, the Apoſtolick Hiſtory in general, the Epiſtles of St. *Paul,* the whole

whole Courſe of St. *Peter*'s Life, and many Difficulties, which Sacred Antiquity can produce, and which the moſt ſubtil Sophiſms cannot elude, abſolutely condemn and diſown ſuch Falſities; with which the Teſtimonies of the Ancients agrees, particularly *Origen* and *Lactantius*, who affirm that St. *Peter*, towards the End of his Life, in the Reign of the Emperor *Nero*, came to *Rome*, which he enobled with his Blood. St. *Peter* of *Alexandria* ſays the ſame, and many others. Theſe Steps of Sacred Antiquity make it appear ſo plain, that *Valeſius*, *Henſchenius*, *Papebrochius*, *Baluzius*, and other the moſt eminent Chronologers, being fully convinc'd, have given up the Cauſe: But to go on with the Proof againſt the Papal Supremacy out of their own Forgeries.

The next Inſtance againſt it is out of one of Pope *Hyginus*'s Epiſtles, which forbids all *Foreign Juriſdiction*, becauſe it is unfit they ſhould be judg'd Abroad, who have Judges at Home. *Lab. T.* 1. *p.* 567. *Bin. p.* 66. *col.* 2. And yet this is an apparent Forgery, as has been ſhewn already in that Pope's Life.

The Third Epiſtle of Pope *Fabian*, which is as notorious a Forgery as any, being ſtolen out of the Decrees of Pope *Sixtus* III. appoints, *That every Cauſe ſhall be tried where the Crime is committed*; which Paſſage is alſo in a genuine Epiſtle of St. *Cyprian* to *Cornelius*. *Lab. T.* 1. *p.* 698. *Bin. p.* 119. *col.* 2. And all Foreign Juriſdiction is again forbid in Pope *Felix* his Second Epiſtle, *ib. p.* 906. which Paſſages do utterly deſtroy Appeals to *Rome*, unleſs they can prove all the Crimes in the World are committed there. The Second Epiſtle of Pope *Fabian* allows *the People to reprove their Biſhop, if he err in Matters of Faith. Lab. T.* 1. *p.* 640. *Bin. p.* 97. *col.* 1. And the ſame Liberty is given to the People in *Cornelius*'s

nelius's Second Epiſtle, *ib. p.* 671. which ſeems to make People Judges in Matters of Faith, a Thing which the modern *Romaniſts* charge upon others as a great Error; and yet we find from their own Accounts, in the Life of Pope *Liberius*, the People were ſo ſenſible of his Erring in Faith, that they refuſed Communion with him; and it was high Time to avoid him, when, after all the pretended Infallibility, he more than once laps'd into Idolatry, by ſacrificing to Heathen Idols. From theſe and many other Paſſages we may ſee, that theſe Impoſtures do not in all Points agree with the preſent *Roman* Church; and by their too great Aſſurance very often invalidate what they would have the World believe. But to return to Pope *Innocent* II.

The Fifth Epiſtle of this Pope to the foreſaid Patriarch of *Jeruſalem*, is of the ſame Style, and to the ſame Purpoſe; but with this Reſerve in caſe of Obedience, that tho' he recommends *Fulcher* Archbiſhop of *Tyre* to the Patriarch of *Jeruſalem*, to be obedient to him; yet *Fulcher* pays this Obedience to the Patriarch, but by Command of the holy *Roman* Church. [*Ex Mandato Sanctæ Eccleſiæ Romanæ tibi obedit.*] Which Paſſage the ſame Epiſtle a little more explains towards the End: Where, after the Pope charges the Patriarch to be very tender and careful of *Fulcher*, he bids him, "take Care not to oppreſs under Pretence of Sub-"jection, which he and the Church of *Jeruſalem* "enjoy'd but by the Benefit of the Apoſtolick See. "*Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 949.

The Seventh Epiſtle is to *Ralph* Patriarch of *Antioch*, to whoſe Patriarchate the Archbiſhop of *Tyre* formerly had been ſubject; but, it ſeems, was encourag'd in his Revolt by Pope *Innocent* II. The Deſign of the Epiſtle is, "To command the Pa-

"triarch

" triarch of *Antioch* to oblige the Suffragans of " the Archbiſhoprick of *Tyre* to be obedient to " their Archbiſhop *Fulcher*." And yet in the End of this Epiſtle the Pope wiſhes, " That Prelates " and their Subjects may obſerve each others " Rights without Contradiction." *ib. p.* 950. Now how far the Pope obſerv'd this, or with what Face he could recommend the Obſervance of that to others, which he himſelf at the ſame Time openly violated, I leave to any one to judge by the Matter of this Epiſtle. In the firſt Place he encourages and protects a Renegado againſt his Patriarch; then obliges the injur'd Patriarch, under whoſe Subjection the Suffragan-Biſhops of the Archbiſhoprick of *Tyre* were, to exhort theſe Suffragans to be obedient to their Metropolitan *Fulcher*. Theſe are the moſt irregular and uncanonical Breaches of Diſcipline that any Eccleſiaſtick Governor can be guilty of; and yet at laſt, to ſmooth up all, and give a Colour to theſe Actions, pretends to pray for Right and Order in the Church. *ib. p.* 950. This Pope's Eighth and Ninth Epiſtles are the two vileſt Pieces of Cant imaginable, conſidering that at the ſame Time that he preaches up Unanimity and Peace to *Gerard*, *Baldwin*, *Bernard*, and other of the Suffragan-Biſhops of *Tyre*, he himſelf is guilty of the Breach of both in a moſt ſcandalous Manner; firſt, in aſſuming a Title of Dominion over *Jeruſalem*, and other Eaſtern Churches, which he nor his Predeceſſors ever had any Right to; and next, in as unjuſtly proſecuting it as he had aſſum'd it, by claiming the Obedience of thoſe who were always before allow'd to be his Equals.

The reſt of this Pope's Epiſtles are of the ſame Texture, all of them claiming Sovereignty over Foreign Churches and Monaſteries, nay and over

Kings too; witneſs the Ninth Epiſtle (*Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 951.) of this Pope to *Roger* King of *Sicily*, wherein he pretends to confirm the Title of King of *Sicily*, Duke of *Apulia*, and Prince of *Capua*, before beſtow'd on him by Pope *Honorius*; obliging him to be dutiful and obſervant of Mother Church, and not to fail of the yearly Tribute which he was to pay. His Epiſtles to the Kings of *Denmark* and *Sweden*, and, in ſhort, all the reſt of them, are but ſo many diſtinct Claims of Dominion over the Perſons to whom he writes; ſo that theſe Epiſtles are inſerted for no other Reaſon (whether they be genuine or not is not the Point) than to aſſert the Univerſal Supremacy both in Church and State; and upon Occaſion, tho' apparent Forgeries, ſhall ſerve for authentick Proof.

Before we take Leave of this Pope, I muſt add one Paſſage relating to *Ralph* Patriarch of *Antioch*, whom we lately mentioned. The Editors, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1026. out of *William* of *Tyre*, tell a Story very little to the Reputation of the Biſhop of *Rome*; nor can I ſee what End it can anſwer, except to ſhew the abſolute Sovereignty which they pretend was always inherent to St. *Peter*'s Chair. "*Alberic* Archbiſhop of *Oſtia*, as Pontifical Legate, preſided in the Council of *Antioch*, *A. D.* 1142. at which, among others, *Fulcher* Archbiſhop of *Tyre*, a devout Creature of the Pope's, and, upon whom for the Conſummation of the Buſineſs, Legate *Alberic* ſolely depended, was preſent; who, *the more to ſtrengthen the Intereſt of his Party*, brought with him his two Suffragans, *Baldwin* Biſhop of *Berytus*, and *Bernard* Biſhop of *Sidon*. The Council being ſat, the Pope's Commiſſion is read, and the Accuſers appear, two of which were *Arnulf* and *Lambert* the Archdeacons, who,

" beſides other Favours, had been lately reſtor'd " to his Benefice by the Patriarch ; notwithſtan- " ding which, he ungratefully turns Evidence " againſt him." Another Evidence againſt the Patriarch, was *Serlo* Archbiſhop of *Apamea*: This *Serlo* is not number'd among the Evidence at firſt, but only drops as it were by Chance from the Editors in theſe Words of *Tyrius*, *ib. p.* 1027. " Whilſt " theſe Things were tranſacting, *Serlo* Archbiſhop " of *Apamea* is by the Legate obſerv'd to ſit in " the Council without his Pontifical Habit, who " asks him, Why he differ'd thus from the reſt of his " Brethren ; and, *why he did not proceed in his Accu-* " *ſation as he had begun* ? Theſe are literally the " Words of *Tyrius*. To which the Archbiſhop " anſwers, What I have done, was inconſiderate " Heat and Raſhneſs, and againſt the Intereſt of " my own Soul, detracting from my Holy Father, " and, like curſed *Cham*, expoſing my Father's " Nakedneſs ; but now, by the Grace of God, I " am recovered from my Error ; and am ſo far " from preſumptuouſly accuſing or judging him, " that I am ready to lay my Life down for his " Sake. Upon this, *Serlo* is commanded to depart " the Council, and the Sentences of Excommuni- " cation and Degradation being pronounc'd againſt " him, he is, right or wrong, [*ſive juſte, ſive aliter*] " depoſed from his Sacerdotal and Pontifical Fun- " ction, and retiring to his Dioceſs, ſoon bid adieu " to the World." This is horrid, but the worſt Part of the Story is to come: They go on, and would ſeem to lay the Odium on the Prince of the Place ; but let him be as wicked as can be ſuppos'd, the Pope's Legate went Hand in Hand with him, nay was directly his Tool and Executioner. " So " great a Dread, ſays *Tyrius*, *ibid.* of the Prince, " who was too much of the Legate's Party, had

" poſſeſs'd them all, that no Body dare contradict " any Thing that was ſaid." But to return to the Accuſation of the Patriarch of *Antioch*: " The " Crimes laid to his Charge were irregular and " uncanonical entering on his Patriarchate, Incon- " tinence, and Simony." Theſe are Crimes of a high Nature, and ſuch as required a moſt exact Scrutiny; but none of them, according to the Editors Author *Tyrius*, were prov'd. Nay, they invalidate their own Story; or, at leaſt, make their Author do it himſelf: For of the two firſt Accuſers, *viz.* *Arnulf* and *Lambert*, he fixes an infamous Stigma on the laſt, by calling him ungrateful for accuſing the Patriarch; which no honeſt Man could have done, if the Patriarch had been guilty of the Crimes charged on him; for his Conviction would have wip'd off the Stain of Ingratitude from *Lambert*. But the Patriarch's Innocence appears more in the Behaviour of Archbiſhop *Serlo* than any Thing elſe. It's certain *Serlo* was ſenſibly convinc'd he had wrong'd the Patriarch, by his charging himſelf with inconſiderate Temerity in ſcandalouſly accuſing him, indangering thereby his own Soul; and at the ſame Time in the moſt pungent Sorrow reproaches himſelf with curſed *Cham*'s Character, for diſcovering his Father's Nakedneſs; offering by Way of Attonement, to lay down his Life for his Sake. This is ſo convincing a Circumſtance in Favour of the Patriarch's Innocence, that they who will condemn him muſt make *Serlo* a mad Man. And it is plain he at laſt acted with the Deliberation of a ſober Man, being ſenſible that God's Grace had recover'd him from a dangerous Error; and his ſevere Contrition and Regret for his paſt Injuſtice, plainly demonſtrates the Sincerity of his Repentance.

The

The Legate's Buſineſs in this Council was to maintain the Univerſality of his Maſter; and therefore he muſt ſide with thoſe that ſupport that Topick: But in promoting that, Ambition ſo blinded him, that he had not the leſt Regard either to his own Integrity, or the Character he bore; otherwiſe he would never have conſented to be made a Tool to promote the vileſt Action in the World. "*Petrus Armoinus*, ſays *Tyrius*, *ibid.* "*p.* 1028. a very wicked Man, and Governor of "the City, had a great Influence over the Prince, "a Man very unwary and indiſcreet. This *Petrus* "*Armoinus* therefore thought with himſelf, if the "Patriarch were depoſed, he might through his "Intereſt with the Prince get his Nephew *Haymeric* promoted to the Patriarchal See, whom not "long before the Patriarch had imprudently made "Dean of that Church: Which was accordingly "done." So that here it is plain, the Legate was the Property in promoting the Purpoſes of theſe Men; which he did in a moſt infamous Manner, and vaſtly different from the Character of a Clergyman. The poor Patriarch, without Doubt, was appriz'd of the Deſigns againſt him; for after three Summons to appear, he refuſed. "Whether his "own Conſcience ſtruck him, ſays *Tyrius*, *ibid.* or "whether fearing the Prejudice of the Synod, "which was pack'd againſt him, and the Malice "of the Prince, we cannot ſay; but he, as before, "refus'd the Third Time to come. He remain'd "in his Palace, being accompanied with a great "Number of Horſe and Foot, who came from all "Parts of the City to his Relief; and, had it not "been for the mighty Power of the Prince, the "Legate, and all thoſe that join'd with him in the "Patriarch's Depoſition, had with Shame been "forc'd to fly the City. The Legate, ſeeing the

" Patriarch would not come to him, being ſupported
" by the Power and Intereſt of the Prince, advances
" to the Patriarch's Palace, where delivering the
" Sentence of Depoſition againſt him, he by Force
" compell'd him to ſurrender his Ring and Croſs;
" and then, at the Command of the ſame Legate,
" he is deliver'd up to the Prince, who, like a Man
" of Blood, cauſes him to be put in Irons, and
" treated moſt ignominiouſly, being impriſon'd in
" the Monaſtery of St. *Simeon*, on the Top of a
" high Hill near the Sea; whence, after a long
" Confinement, he eſcap'd, and went to *Rome*;
" where having received ſome ſmall Favour from
" the Apoſtolick See, as he was preparing to re-
" turn, he was by ſome Body poiſon'd; but by
" whom not known." Here was a Concatenation of Wickedneſs; a Set of vile Men wanted to put a ſpecious Face upon a wicked Deſign, to make it look plauſible in the Eye of the World, and they found one ready for their Purpoſe in the Perſon of the Pope's Legate; nothing leſs than the Authority of the Apoſtolick See muſt grace their Pretenſions. A ſeeming legal Synod call'd, though compos'd of pack'd Creatures, a Legate preſiding in this Synod wholely at the Devotion of the Prince, which Prince is influenc'd and manag'd by a profligate Wretch that govern'd the City. A hopeful Proſpect of juſt and regular Proceedings in ſuch a Synod! One of the Accuſers ſtigmatiz'd with ill Fame; another recants, and deſerts ſo wicked a Cauſe, for which he is excommunicated and depos'd, right or wrong, and ſoon after dies of Grief. The impatient Legate, tired with the Slowneſs of three Days Proceeding, with an arm'd Force attacks the Patriarch's Palace, executes the Sentence of Depoſition on him in Perſon, by compelling him to deliver up his Ring and Croſs, the Enſigns

of

of his Patriarchate, and then delivers him up to the Secular Prince, who treated him with the utmoſt Inhumanity. The Character which *Tyrius* gives this Patriarch is very ſtrange, being a Compound of Good and Evil; and which we have good Reaſon to believe, becauſe *Tyrius* ſays, when he was young he himſelf had ſeen him. "He was, ſays "he, a Man of a comely Perſon, tolerably learned, of an eloquent and pleaſant Speech, very "graceful and liberal, a great Lover of Military "Men, unmindful of his Promiſe, ſubtile and inconſtant, yet provident and diſcreet; and moſt "imprudent in this, that he would not be reconcil'd to thoſe whom he had juſtly made his Enemies; very arrogant, and conceited of himſelf, "from which Preſumption proceeded all his Misfortunes." But granting all this, there is nothing in this Character, or if it were much worſe, that can juſtify theſe Irregularities againſt him. The worſt of Men have a Right to Juſtice equal with the moſt vertuous and innocent, and therefore this Character of the Patriarch out of *Tyrius* does no Way diminiſh the Injuſtice of his Proſecuters; but beſides, as *Tyrius* tells the whole Story, he makes the Synod that condemn'd the Patriarch a pack'd Company, expoſes the Legate as over-officious, and impatient in proſecuting ſo vehemently; and, which is the worſt Part of all, plainly makes the Pope's Legate the Tool and Property throughout the whole Proceeding. All this Noiſe, and the Deſign of the whole Tranſaction, was for nothing but to remove the Patriarch, to make Way for the Governor's Nephew, which was accordingly done, and the Legate the main Agent in it. Had the Patriarch been a Man of Penetration, after ſuch foul and inhumane Treatment as he had met with in his own Territories from the Apoſto-

lick Legate, he could not expect much better at *Rome*; and therefore of all Places in the World, after he had escap'd out of Prison, *Rome* should have been the last Place of his Retirement. However, he unwarily went thither, where he pays for his Presumption with the Loss of his Life; one Draught of Poison, from no Body knows whom, putting an End to all Animosities; but not to the indelible Stain which such irregular and unjust Proceedings must contract in the Opinion of impartial Judges. But how uncanonical soever these Doings were, the main Point was gain'd, *viz.* The Supremacy of the Patriarch of *Rome* was establish'd in the West, where he by his Legates acts as Arbitrarily as a Monarch circumscrib'd within no Laws or Bounds; and it must be for this End only that they tell this Story, which otherwise would much detract from the Character of a Bishop of the First See.

There were Six several Councils held at *Constantinople*, from the Year 1140 to 1168, all of them called upon very dangerous and flagrant Heresies, none of which are mentioned by the Editors; and tho' the Bishop of *Rome* was no more concern'd in them, than his Predecessors formerly had been in several others; yet, being called upon such extraordinary Occasions, it is a Wonder they are not inserted, as usually, tho' with only this, That these Councils were held in such a Pope's Time, though they knew nothing of them. But whatever the Occasion was, they are left out by the Editors; tho' they were called to extirpate such dangerous Heresies, as that condemn'd in the First *Constantinopolitan* Council of this Century, which was *A. D.* 1140, in the Pontificate of *Innocent* II. against *Constantine Chrysomalus*'s Writings, which maintain'd several heterodox and strange Principles; *viz.* That they

they who paid any Honour or Veneration to any Prince, paid Adoration to the Devil: That all Chriſtians had two Souls, the one ſuſceptible of Sin, the other not; and that if he had but one Soul, he could not be a Chriſtian, *&c.*

The Second *Conſtantinopolitan* Council was in the Year 1143, in the Pontificate of Pope *Celeſtine*, againſt a moſt abominable monſtrous Set of Hereticks, called *Bogomilions*, from *Bogomilus* the Monk, their Founder. This Hereſy was a Medley of Manicheiſm and Maſſalianiſm, and conſiſted of moſt abſurd Opinions. They deſpis'd Chriſtian Theology, and all Doctrine concerning the Oeconomy of Chriſt: They called Churches the Temples of Devils, and held the Euchariſtical Sacrifice in the higheſt Diſdain: They allow'd no Secular Perſon, except he became a Monk, to be ſav'd, tho' ever ſo vertuous: That Men might undertake the Sacred Tonſure without the Conſent of their Wives, and Women without the Conſent of their Husbands: That all Chriſtian Relicks within and without Churches ought to be deſtroy'd. In ſhort, they were for rooting up all Canonical Order and Diſcipline, not ſticking at the Anathematization of our Bleſſed Saviour.

The Third *Conſtantinopolitan* Council, *A. D.* 1144, was held by the ſame Patriarch, and much upon the ſame Occaſion, againſt one *Nipho*, a Monk, and Ringleader of the *Bogomilian* Sect; whom the Fathers of this Council ſilenc'd for a Time; but he ſoon broke looſe again, as appears by

The Fourth *Conſtantinopolitan* Council, which was held upon this Occaſion, *A. D.* 1147. *Coſmas Atticus*, lately made Patriarch, was ſo fond of *Nipho* the Monk and Heretick aboveſaid, that tho' he knew he was ſynodically condemn'd, and that it was no leſs Puniſhment than Excommunication to con-

converſe with him, yet admitted him into his Company, contracted a ſtrict Friendſhip with him, and taxes the Decrees made againſt him with Injuſtice. *Nipho* upon this grows very inſolent, with Security and Impunity daily ſpreading his Doctrine, and utterly denying and diſowning the God of the *Hebrews*, as he call'd him. *Coſmas* was cautioned by his Friends not to incourage ſo infamous a Wretch; but he the more obſtinately perſiſts, and ſets a greater Value on the Man; inſomuch that when the Emperor ſent to demand this Heretick to be brought to Juſtice, *Coſmas* oppoſed the Officers, endeavouring to reſcue him from them; which when he could not do, he deſir'd he might be committed to Priſon with him. Upon this, the common People growing tumultuous, a Synod forthwith is aſſembled, in which the Emperor *Manuel Comnenus* preſides. Before whom *Coſmas* being ſummon'd, he openly declares he could not look upon *Nipho* as a Heretick, but eſteem'd him an Orthodox Man. For this, he is by Vote of the Synod condemn'd, and according to the Tenor of the Decree, ſubſcrib'd by One and thirty Metropolitans, is depoſed, as being unworthy of the Patriarchal Dignity. Here was a dangerous Concatenation of Miſchief in theſe Hereſies; and certainly it highly behov'd ſome Body to be active in preventing the Growth of them; and if the Biſhops of *Rome* had had any Claim of Right to the Univerſality they before and ſince have pretended to, here was a glorious Opportunity of exerting it, when ſo great a Part of the Eaſtern Church, as that of *Conſtantinople* was, in Danger of being infected, if not totally poiſon'd, with ſo fatal a Hereſy; and no leſs a Perſon the Fomenter and Encourager of this Hereſy, than a Patriarch. And yet we do not find that the Biſhop of *Rome* was concern'd in it, or ſo much as conſulted in it, having

having no Legate to repreſent him in the Synod; but the Emperor himſelf in Perſon preſided, One and thirty Metropolitans aſſiſting him, beſides a great Number of Princes, Senators and Judges.

The Fifth Council of *Conſtantinople*, *A. D.* 1166, was upon an Occaſion inferior to the former; for it was only upon Suſpicion of Hereſy, the Fact not being prov'd. At this Council there were Three Patriarchs, *Luke* of *Conſtantinople*, *Athanaſius* of *Antioch*, and *Nicephorus* of *Jeruſalem*; and Fifty ſeven Metropolitans, beſides Princes and other illuſtrious Perſons. In this reverend and noble Aſſembly, the *Almarins* were accus'd of Falſe Opinions of the Divine Nature by *Demetrius* of *Lampia*, *John* of *Corcyra*, *Conſtantine* of *Bulgaria*, and *John* of *Irene*, Biſhops. The Cauſe had been protracted for Six Years, and at length was determined here; where the Accuſation being prov'd falſe, the Accuſers were depriv'd of their Dignities, and baniſh'd. Notwithſtanding this Caſe was ſo general, and the Aſſembly conſiſted of ſo many illuſtrious Perſons both in Church and State, yet there is no Mention made of the Biſhop of *Rome*, either by himſelf or Legate. Nor is it to be ſuppos'd, that Caſes of ſo high Concern as theſe Hereſies were, could be tranſacting ſo many Years, *viz.* from *A. D.* 1140, to 1168, without the Knowledge of the Patriarch of the Weſtern Church; tho' we do not find any Cognizance taken of them till

The Sixth and laſt *Conſtantinopolitan* Council of this Century, which was *A. D.* 1168, and that by none of the Editors. The Biſhop of *Rome* indeed, as has been obſerv'd, ſeldom ſlip'd any Opportunity, when Councils were held by the Eaſtern Church, of ſending his Legates, and making large Demands. But by the Occaſion of this Council, which was to procure Reconciliation and Peace between the Eaſtern

Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches, it's plain they had been at long Variance. Notwithſtanding ſeveral Cardinals and Biſhops were ſent on this Purpoſe, yet none of them pretended on the Pope's Behalf to preſide here; but *Michael Anchialis*, the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, preſided. The Demands of the Cardinals and other Weſtern Biſhops were, That the Biſhop of *Rome* ſhould be acknowledg'd by the *Greek* Church to be Supreme Biſhop; That they ſhould commemorate him in their Divine Offices; and, That Appeals to him ſhould be allow'd.

It was the moſt unreaſonable Demand that the Creatures of the Pontificate could make, to have their Biſhop commemorated in their Divine Offices. This was a transferring their Canonical Obedience from their own Patriarch to another, and a direct dethroning of him. It was a particular Injunction, That every Patriarch in his own Diſtrict ſhould be commemorated; a particular Inſtance of which we have in St. *Chryſoſtome*, whilſt he adorn'd the Patriarchal See of *Conſtantinople*. To recognize another Patriarch therefore inſtead of their own, had been a direct dethroning him.

Theſe were unlikely Terms of Reconciliation; and the *Greeks* ſo deſpis'd the Conditions, that the Emperor, Synod and Senate decreed, That the Pope, and all his Adherents, ſhould be cut off from them by a total Separation. The Editors, as I have before mentioned, take no Notice of theſe Things; and we are beholden only to *L. Allatius* for the Account of them. *De Conſen. Orient. & Occident. l.* 11. *c.* 12. *n.* 1. *col.* 664.

I beg Pardon for this Digreſſion from the Series of Time, but the Concatenation of the Matter lead me to it.

[1143.] The next that aſcends the Pontifical Chair is *Guido de Caſtello*, under the Name of Pope *Celeſtine* II. He was firſt Prieſt-Cardinal of the Church of *Rome*, under the Title of St. *Mark*, and in the Year 1140, was ſent Legate into *France* by Pope *Innocent* II. where, for his favourable Inclinations to *Arnald* of *Breſcia*, the Heretick, he was ſeverely reprimanded by St. *Bernard*, as appears in his 188th Epiſtle. This *Arnald* was formerly a Diſciple of *Abaelard*, an excellent Philoſopher, but a Monſter in Point of Religion; whom St. *Bernard* aforeſaid ingeniouſly deſcribes: "When he "ſpeaks of the Trinity, he is an *Arian*; when he "talks of Grace, he is a *Pelagian*; and as to the "Perſon of Chriſt, he is a *Neſtorian*." This was a wretched Compoſition of Blaſphemy and Hereſy; and yet, as vile as it was, the Owner and Profeſſor of theſe Tenets was protected and follow'd by the Princes of the Church; (for ſuch the Cardinals now began to be.) This the ſame St. *Bernard*, in his 187th, 188th, 189th, 192d, and other Epiſtles, makes pretty clear; who having acquainted Pope *Innocent* II. with every Thing relating to this Heretick, expected Sentence againſt him from *Rome*; which by *Bernard*'s Impatience ſeem'd to be delay'd; for he having in the Council of *Sens* confuted *Abaelard*, wrote to the Pope, but at laſt ſent his Letters to him by the Archbiſhop of *Rhemes*, and other Biſhops, about the ſame Argument. He wrote likewiſe to ſeveral Cardinals of the *Roman* Church, and particularly to *Guido de Caſtello*, afterwards Pope *Celeſtine* II. to caution him, that he ſhould not for the Sake of ancient Friendſhip protect *Abaelard*. He wrote likewiſe, ſays the ſame St. *Bernard*, to *Ivo* Cardinal of the Church of *Rome*, and when he had mentioned ſeveral of his Hereſies, he adds, "That the ſaid *Abaelard* and his

"Works

" Works had been before condemn'd by the Apo-
" ſtolick Legate; nevertheleſs he accounted him-
" ſelf ſecure, he ſaid, as having the Cardinals and
" Clergy of the Church of *Rome* his Diſciples.
Lab. T. 10. *p.* 1020, 1021. It's certain, that with-
out ſome Countenance and Favour from one, or
ſome Body of great Men, after Condemnation, he
durſt not have openly profeſs'd his Hereſies; and
had it not been for ſo active and good a Man as
St. *Bernard*, who too plainly perceiv'd the Infalli-
ble Judge and his College of Cardinals to be
ting'd with this Heretick's Principles, *Abaelard* might
have gone on much longer without Interruption.
Otho. Friſing, *l.* 1. *c.* 48, 49. puts this in a yet clearer
Light; and being a Cotemporary with theſe Tranſ-
actions, was capable of giving a truer Account,
and therefore more to be credited. " After theſe
" Things, ſays he, when *Abaelard* again had for ma-
" ny Days read to the People, and drawn a migh-
" ty Concourſe together, *Innocent* II. then being
" Pope at *Rome*, and *Lewis* the Son reigning in
" *France*, he is ſummon'd to *Sens* by the Biſhops
" and Abbot *Bernard*, where in the Preſence of the
" King, Count Palatine, Nobility, *&c.* he is que-
" ſtioned, and his Faith examin'd. But he fearing
" ſome Inſult from the People, appeals to *Rome*;
" upon which the Biſhops and the Abbot wrote a
" Remonſtrance to the Pope, acquainting him
" with their Proceeding, and the Sentence of Con-
" demnation." Which the Pope ſoon after con-
firm'd; and being put in Execution, *Abaelard*'s
Books were burnt, and he retir'd to the Monaſtry
of *Cluny*, where he wrote an Apologetick. Here
was a Knot of dangerous Hereſies repullulating in
the Church, and ſuch as once had almoſt over-
turn'd Chriſtianity; and yet, as vile as they were,
it's plain from the Authors in thoſe Times, the Col-

lege

lege of Cardinals were ſhrewdly ſuſpected, if not really guilty of them; otherwiſe the honeſt Abbot St. *Bernard* need not have given himſelf the Trouble of Writing to them, nor had *Abaelard* appealed from the Council of *Sens* (where St. *Bernard* ſo warmly engag'd him, even to Confutation) to the Apoſtolick See, but that he had Hopes of better Quarter than the honeſt Abbot gave him; and conſidering how dilatory the Pope had been in this Caſe, that St. *Bernard* was forc'd to write by the Archbiſhop of *Rhemes* and others Biſhops, I do not ſee but that *Abaelard* might have gone on: Only St. *Bernard* ferreted him, would not let him reſt, till he had either reclaim'd him, or brought him to Juſtice. This was a neceſſary Digreſſion, becauſe it is a Diſcovery of the Principles of Pope *Celeſtine* II. before he was advanc'd to the Pontifical Throne, and therefore I hope will be more readily excus'd.

The Editors begin the Life of Pope *Celeſtine* II. with a very inauſpicious Blunder, to prove an Innovation. They ſay this Pope, according to a Conſtitution of his Predeceſſor *Innocent* II. in which the People were forbid to meddle in the Election of a Pope, was the firſt that was choſen without the Suffrages of the People. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1030. The Reaſon of this is plain from themſelves, *ibid.* for the College of Cardinals having grown from a minute Beginning to a Temporal Principality, the *Roman* Senate was laid aſide; and therefore, out of *Onuphrius*, the Editors ſay, the *Romans* attempting to reſtore the Senate to their ancient Rights, this Pope was choſen without the Votes of the People. He himſelf, in his Epiſtle to the Monks of *Cluny*, ſpeaks plainer, and ſays, *ib. p.* 1031. "The Cardinal-Prieſts and Deacons choſe him, "together with the Brethren the Biſhops and Sub-

"deacons,

" deacons, the Clergy and People making great " Acclamation." So that it is plain on all Hands, *Celeſtine* II. was choſen without the People. But whence the Editors had this Conſtitution, or where it is, they would do well to let us know. There is nothing of it mentioned in the Epiſtles of Pope *Innocent* II. nothing in the Account they give us of the Councils, or in any Canon of them, during his Pontificate. To ſay therefore, that an Election was made according to Canon or Conſtitution, and produce no ſuch, nor direct where it is to be found, is the worſt Sort of Forgery; and but too apparently ſhews, That when they are ſtrong enough to carry their Point by Force, they never want a Pretence or Authority to juſtify their Innovations.

The good old Abbot *Bernard*, who never before had been ſparing of his good Advice to Pope *Innocent* II. and his Cardinals, when he thought or ſaw them in Danger, could not let Pope *Celeſtine* II. paſs without an Admonition, when he ſaw him committing an irregular Action. There was one *William*, Treaſurer of the Church of *York*, (a Man of very wicked Morals, whom Pope *Innocent* had condemn'd and baniſh'd) that was ſurreptitiouſly obtruded on the See of *York*, and by this Pope *Celeſtine* II. ordained and conſecrated. The good old Abbot complains of this to the Pope himſelf, and taxes him with Irregularity: But he might as well have been ſilent, for his Holineſs's Infallibility knew better than to be corrected by an Abbot.

[1144.] Pope *Lucius* II. ſucceeds, who before was called *Gerard*. He was a great Favourite of Pope *Honorius* II. by whom he was made Cardinal-Prieſt, with the Title of S. Croſs of *Jeruſalem*, and Librarian of the Church of *Rome*; and of *Innocent* II. who made him Chancellor of the Apoſtolick

ſtolick See, and Governor of the City of *Beneventum*; which, like a true militant Prieſt, he bravely defended againſt *Roger* King of *Sicily*. He was, in Imitation of his Predeceſſor *Celeſtine* II. choſen without the Conſent of the People; and, to perpetuate this Cuſtom, (for which the Editors ſhew no Authority) he, ſay they, like a prudent and reſolute Man, by the Advice of the Friends of the Church, compell'd thoſe Senators, who, contrary to the Prohibition, of his Predeceſſor Pope *Innocent* II. had aſcended the Capitol, (*i. e.* in order to the Election of the Pope) to abjure the Senate. This was carrying Things with a high Hand indeed; and not only made his Reign uneaſy, but ſhorten'd his Life, according to *Baronius*, who ſays, that as he was endeavouring to drive the ſeditious *Romans* out of the Capitol, he was ſtruck with a Stone from an unknown Hand, of which Hurt he died. His Epiſtle to the Emperor *Conrad* is written in a different Style to what his Predeceſſors us'd. No bullying and domineering, but the moſt abject ſupplicating for Help. Indeed, the *Romans* us'd him very coarſly; for they ſtripp'd him of his *Regalia*, as well within the City, as without, ſubjecting him wholly to the Patrician, whom they had ſet over the Senators, allowing him no more than the Tythes and Oblations for his Maintenance. Upon the Death of Pope *Lucius* II,

[1145.] *Bernard* mounts the Papal Throne by the Name of *Eugene* III. whoſe Election being diſapprov'd of by the *Romans*, eſpecially that Part of them call'd *Arnaldiſts*, he was forced to fly the City. The Editors indeed do not ſay he was choſen by the Cardinals; but it is certain he was not choſen with Conſent of the People, becauſe they tell us the *Romans* in general were enrag'd at his Election; who being grown weary of the Pontifical Empire, endeavour'd to recover the Idea of their

ancient *Roman* Liberty, and ſet up one *Jordan* for Patrician, to whom they compell'd the Nobility to ſubmit. The Confuſion of theſe Times is well deſcrib'd by *Cabbaſutius, Eccleſ. Not. p.* 408. to which I refer the Reader: During which, whilſt Pope *Eugene* III. was at *Viterbium*, the Editors, out of *Otho Friſing.* tell a Story very much to the Advantage of their belov'd Supremacy, to thoſe that can believe it. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1043. The Place they cite, is *Otto. Chron. L.* 7. *cap.* 32. "Whilſt Pope "*Eugene* was at *Viterbium*, the Legates of the *Ar-* "*menian* Biſhops, and their Metropolitan, whom "they call *Catholick*, that is, Univerſal, as having "above a Thouſand Biſhops under him, came from "the furtheſt Part of the Eaſt to him, offering "Subjection to him on Behalf of their Church." This Subjection, we are to obſerve, was paid to the *Roman* Pontiff over and above the Errand theſe Legates came about; for the ſubſequent Words tell the Occaſion of this long Journey from the furtheſt Parts of the Eaſt to *Rome*. "The *Armenians* and "the *Greeks* in ſome Things concerning the Rites "of the Sacrifice agree, in others they differ: "They both uſe the Bread alive; but the *Arme-* "*nians* do not mix Water with the Wine, as the "*Greeks* and we do. Thus differing in theſe and "other Things, they choſe the *Roman* Church "their Judge, deſiring to have her Form of Sacri- "fice, according to Cuſtom, delivered to them. "The Biſhop of *Rome* receives them kindly, ad- "mits them to the Solemnity of the Maſs, and "the Secrets of the Sacrifice; adviſing them dili- "gently to obſerve what was tranſacted at the "ſame Time: Which whilſt they were doing, as "they ſtood devoutly by the Holy Altar, one of "them, who was a Biſhop, (as he himſelf after- "wards declared in a full Aſſembly) whilſt the "Pope

" Pope was performing the Sacred Myſteries, ſaw " the Sun-Beams in a moſt ſplendid Manner gliſter " about his Head, and Two Doves lighting on his " Head; and when he had ſtrictly look'd about to " ſee whence that Light ſhould come, and could " no Way diſcover the Place of its Entrance, he " look'd upon this as the Work of God; and be- " ing now more deſirous to acknowledge Obe- " dience to the Church of *Rome*, he diſcovered " what he had ſeen to all.

" We ſaw likewiſe (ſays the ſame Author) at " that Place the Biſhop of *Gabula* from *Syria*, (by " whoſe Means *Antioch* began to ſubmit to the See " of *Rome*) complaining of the Patriarch of *An-* " *tioch*, and the Daughter of *Baldwin* formerly " King of *Jeruſalem*; and alſo demanding the " Tythe of the Spoils taken from the *Saracens*, " after the Example of *Abraham* exacting the ſame " from *Melchiſedech*.

Theſe are Stories tranſcending Belief, and fit for none but the moſt benumm'd Biggots: And tho' *Otho*, as the Editors cite him, affirms he ſaw theſe Paſſages, I cannot readily credit them for theſe Reaſons:

1. Here are Legates which come from one *Univerſal* Biſhop to another; and this Metropolitan, from whom the Legates came, was numerically call'd *Univerſal*, from the vaſt Number of Biſhops within his Diſtrict, above a Thouſand, ſays the Author. I muſt confeſs, the Number is large, and ſuch as, I dare venture to affirm, at that Time ſcarce any Metropolitan beſides himſelf could claim. But that which is moſt ſhocking, is, theſe Legates came from *almoſt the furtheſt Parts of the Eaſt*. Now if the Metropolitan of *Armenia*'s Province reach'd ſo far as *almoſt the furtheſt Parts of the Eaſt*, it exceeded the Extent of the Patriarchates of thoſe

Days, and interfered very much with thoſe of *Antioch* and *Jeruſalem*; to one of which, it is highly probable, *Armenia* was ſubject. But this is ſtill to magnify the *Roman* Supremacy, which they will have to ſtretch from one End of the World to the other; though it is as inſignificant in many Places as it is in *China* or *Japan*. Beſides, though the Author ſays, the Legates came but from *almoſt the furtheſt Parts of the Eaſt*; yet it was ſo far, that, *ibid.* he ſays, they were a Year and a half a coming; which, at a very moderate Way of travelling, and by the moſt modeſt Computation, muſt be ſome Thouſands of Miles: The Truth of which I cannot but queſtion, for Chriſtianity at that Time of Day had leſs Ground far Eaſtward.

2. That which next ſeems to invalidate this Story, is, we have no Account of it in any Council, either in the Eaſtern or the Weſtern Church. It ever was the Cuſtom to debate Differences of this Nature that theſe Legates came about in Council; and they needed not have gone ſo far as *Rome* for a Determination at that Time, when *Conſtantinople*, *&c.* were nearer. Nor is it to be imagin'd, that the Biſhop of *Rome*, upon gaining ſo advantagious a Point as the Submiſſion of ſo conſiderable a Part of the Eaſtern Church to his See, would have received them without ſome very publick Recognition. A Council had been the proper Manner in an Affair of this Nature, or at leſt more Witneſſes than the Tranſactors of the Thing; for we have only their Authority for it, who cannot be imagined to be otherwiſe than crack'd-brain'd, or elſe after ſo incredible Stories they would not,

3. Dare to confirm this prepoſterous Story with the moſt ridiculous Legend, and the worſt put together that ever was invented. Firſt it ſays, after the Pope had admitted them to the Maſs, *&c.*

which

which whilſt they were doing, and ſtood devoutly by the Holy Altar, one of them, who was a Biſhop, ſpy'd the Coruſcation of Light about the Pope's Head, and the Two Doves aſcending and deſcending on him. This the ſaid Biſhop declared in a full Aſſembly, &c. So incredible a Story ought to have been back'd better than by one Witneſs, eſpecially when there were more preſent; beſides, *Otho* the Author, who was preſent at theſe Things, does put in his *Vidimus* to this Part of it, as he does to others; but only tells what another ſays; whereas his own Teſtimony had been equally good with anothers.

4. The latter Part of the Story about the Church of *Antioch* ſubmitting to the See of *Rome*, is no more than a further Encroachment, ſtill laying Claim to what ſhe had no Right, and is no more to believed than that they received the Tythe of the Spoils taken from the *Saracens*; which is very unlikely at that Time, for the ſame Author, *ibid. p.* 1044. makes the Chriſtians to be in ſuch a low Condition, that they were far from taking Spoils from the *Saracens*, who gain'd conſiderably upon them. *Audivimus eum Periculum tranſmarinæ Eccleſiæ poſt captam Edeſſam lacrymabiliter conquerentem*: "We "heard him, ſays he, (*i. e.* the Biſhop of *Gabula*) "with Tears deploring the Danger of the Church "beyond Sea, after the taking of *Edeſſa*.

As to the Story of *William* Treaſurer of the Church of *York*, whom Pope *Innocent* II. had condemned and baniſhed for his ſcandalous and immoral Life, and whom Pope *Celeſtine* II. thruſts afterwards into the See of *York*, Pope *Eugene* III. to preſerve the Juſtice of the Papal Chair, condemned and baniſhed: But the Editors ſpoil the Merit of the Act; for they ſay, *ibid. p.* 1045. that he did it at the Inſtance of St. *Bernard*, not of his own Accord; ſo that his Holineſs was but the Abbot's

Inſtrument, and he had ſeen, notwithſtanding his ſagacious Infallibility, no more into the Demerits of *William* of *York*, than his Predeceſſor Pope *Celeſtine* II. who would not be perſwaded by the ſame Abbot to do Juſtice on the Criminal.

There are Eighty three Epiſtles aſcribed to this Pope, every one of which, like ſo many Champions of the Pontificate, magnify the vaſt Extent of Power inveſted in the Biſhop of *Rome*. This Pope, like many or moſt of his Predeceſſors, ſhews a peculiar Eſteem to Abbots; by cajoling of whom, and domineering over Biſhops when he writes to them, it is plain he prefers them before his own Order: A great Inſtance of which we have in the Epiſtles of this Pope. When he writes to *Sugerius* Abbot of St. *Dionyſius* in *France*, he expreſſes himſelf with the greateſt Tenderneſs and Friendſhip; applauds every Thing he does; ſets him at the Head of the Church of *Paris*, as the King had ſet him at the Head of the State during his Voyage to the Holy Land: His Words ſoft, when he obliges him to do any Thing; *commonemus*, *exhortamur*, *& rogamus*, are his uſual Terms; few *Mandamus's* to him, which is the Pope's conſtant Words when he writes to any Archbiſhop or Biſhop.

The old Pique againſt the Church of *Ravenna* (which we have before mention'd) is revived by Pope *Eugene* III. who, after the Manner of his Predeceſſors, lops off as much of her Power as he could conveniently come at. In his Sixty fifth Epiſtle to *Moſes* Archbiſhop of *Ravenna*, he tells him, that, *ſalvo ſuo Jure*, he had, by Vertue of his Apoſtolick Authority, confirmed the Election of the Biſhop of *Placentia*; and yet, in the Sixty ſixth Epiſtle, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1087. he ſtrips the Church of *Ravenna* of all Power in this Caſe, by inveſting himſelf and his Succeſſors with the ſole Power of

conſe-

conſecrating the Biſhop of *Placentia*: And this he does with a *ſalvo Jure Ravennatis Eccleſiæ*; yet toward the End of this Epiſtle he ſays: "That by "the Advice of his Brethren he had reſolved, "that the Biſhop Elect of *Placentia* and his Succeſ- "ſors ſhould receive their Conſecration without "Contradiction from the Archbiſhop of *Ravenna*, "and his Succeſſors, as their Metropolitans, and "pay Canonical Obedience and Reverence to "them as ſuch." But cuts off all again at laſt with *ſalva in omnibus Apoſtolicæ Sedis Autoritate*; which no Doubt he would take more Care to obſerve for himſelf, than he had done for the Archbiſhop of *Ravenna*. But all this proceeded from the old Grudge: *Rome* look'd upon *Ravenna* as a dangerous Neighbour, if not Rival: She had often given Check to the exorbitant Power of the Apoſtolick See: And though, as has been obſerved, the Biſhops of *Rome* had diveſted her of ſeveral Cities, and brought her very low, yet *Rome* ſtill had an evil Eye upon her, and either ſaw or fancied ſomething which might make her apprehenſive of Danger from that Quarter, and therefore endeavours to diſable her from doing any further Diſſervice.

There is one Thing very remarkable among theſe Epiſtles of Pope *Eugene* III. and that is the Growth of Cardinals, who were arrived to the Number of Twenty two, at leſt, ſo many ſubſcribing to Pope *Eugene*'s Ninth Epiſtle, which he wrote to the Canons of St. *Peter* at *Rome*.

[1153.] *Anaſtaſius* IV. before call'd *Conrad*, ſucceeds Pope *Eugene* III. of whom the Editors ſay but little; for he ſate but a Year and Four Months; only this, that he was well vers'd in the Affairs of the Court of *Rome*. After which ſhort Enjoyment of the Papacy, he made Way for

[1154.] *Adrian* IV. an *Engliſh* Man, formerly

call'd *Nicolas Breakſpear*, born at *Langly* near St. *Alban's* in *Hertfordſhire*, and was the Son of one *Robert* a Monk and Prieſt, notwithſtanding the Vows of Celibacy and Prohibition againſt Marriage and Concubinage in thoſe Days. Being grown up, he had a Deſire to be enter'd in the Monaſtery of St. *Alban's*; but *Richard* the Abbot, for what Reaſons is not known, refuſed him. Being diſappointed here, he went to *Paris*, and for ſome Time ſtudied there. Afterwards being admitted in the Monaſtery of St. *Rufus* near *Valentia*, he ſoon became Prior, and afterwards Abbot. Going to *Rome* about the Affairs of the Monaſtery, he was by Pope *Eugene* III. made Cardinal and Biſhop of St. *Alban's*. He was a ſtrenuous Champion, and a faithful Creature of the Pontificate; of whoſe Rights, both before and after he was Pope, he was an irrefragable Aſſerter. The Editors give him a ſhort and yet ample Character out of the *Vatican* MSS. calling him, "a Man of a ſweet and "gentle Diſpoſition, well skill'd in the *Greek* and "*Latin* Tongues, an elegant and fluent Preacher, "his Voice of a ſweet Tone or Accent, ſlow to "Anger, ſwift to forgive, a chearful and charitable Giver, and enrich'd with all Virtues and "Morals." This is a moſt ample Character indeed; and undoubtedly his Abilities were great, or he had not been employed in ſuch conſiderable and difficult Embaſſies; as particularly that in *Norway* and *Denmark*, where he propagated the Chriſtian Faith amongſt a barbarous People, and ſettled an Archiepiſcopal Seat in the Church of *Upſal*. The firſt Thing after he came to be Pope, was to quell that dangerous Sect of People call'd *Arnoldiſts*; which he effectually did, by executing their Leader *Arnold*, Biſhop of *Breſcia*, on a Croſs, and afterwards burning his Body to Aſhes, and throwing them

them into the *Tyber*, to prevent any ſuperſtitious Adoration of his Body by the People. There is one Thing to be obſerved in the Editors: They are ſeldom ſparing of a good Character of their Popes, if they be but Men of tolerable Virtue and Capacity; and therefore we are not to expect any Account of their Errors from them. But their Epiſtles very often ſhew Blots, that, notwithſtanding all their Art and Cunning, they cannot conceal; though ſometimes the Dates of them, or the Want of Dates, make the Matter ſomewhat obſcure. This Pope, in the Year 1155, having quieted the *Arnoldiſts*, excommunicated *William* King of *Sicily* for waſting the Country of *Campania*; who, the Year following, ſhut up his Holineſs in *Beneventum*, where he cloſely beſieged him, and compell'd him to accept of very hard and ſcandalous Terms of Peace. To this the Editors, in this Pope's Life, give a quite different Turn. But Pope *Adrian*'s Eighth Epiſtle to *William* King of *Sicily* ſets the Matter in a true Light; for it confirms the Title of the Kingdom on him, and all other Privileges extorted from the Pope through Force or Fear; which indeed do too often prevail with timerous Minds. But ſetting aſide the Conceſſion of Title and Privileges, the Epiſtle is one of the moſt fulſome Pieces of Flattery I ever ſaw. The Editors indeed ſay, that *William* of *Sicily* had ſeized on ſome Lands of the Church, becauſe the Pope in his Letters to him had not in the Inſcription call'd him King. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1141. But whatever was wanting in thoſe Letters, he has plentifully made up in this, *ib. p.* 1151. "Tho' "we are enjoin'd by God to embrace all the Faith-"ful in the Arms of paternal Charity, and to in-"vite them to Peace and Concord; yet Kings "and Perſons of high Rank lay a greater Claim

"to

" to our Love and Eſteem; and we ought more " earneſtly to admoniſh them of the Benefit of " Peace, becauſe they are more capable of im- " proving it for the Advantage of the Faithful. " And it is plain, moſt dear Son in Chriſt, and " glorious King of *Sicily*, that you appear eminent " among the greateſt Perſons of the Age, for " your noble Acts, Power, and Wealth: Inſo- " much that the Vigour of your Juſtice, by which " you maintain the Conſtitution of your Domi- " nions; the Security of Peace, which your Sub- " jects comfortably enjoy; and the Terror which " your Heroick Deeds have ſtruck into the Ene- " mies of the Name of Chriſt, have ſpread your " Fame through all Parts of the World." This is literally the Sum of his Epiſtle to King *William* of *Sicily:* And yet this dear Son of the Church, this glorious King, this Champion for the Cauſe of Chriſtianity, was at this very Time under Sentence of Excommunication; or, if we ſuppoſe that his Excommunication was taken off, it could not have been ſo long as to have merited the Character above-mentioned; for this Epiſtle is dated but in *June*, 1156. and it was but ſome time the Year before that the Pope paſſed the Sentence of Excommunication on him; ſo that he muſt mend very faſt to deſerve this Encomium, or his Holineſs's Neceſſity muſt be very preſſing to extort ſuch a nauſeous Piece of Flattery from him. This was a great Inſtance of humane Frailty; and ſhews, that his Infallibility was as liable to it as any Part of the mortal Man.

The ſame Year that this Sentence was paſs'd againſt K. *William* of *Sicily*, the Emperor *Frederic Barbaroſſa* with a great Army enters *Italy*; whom the Pope meeting, he denied him the Kiſs of Peace, until (good Man, to ſhew his Meekneſs and Humility!) he had made

made him perform the Office of Yeoman of the Stirrop: After which they lovingly went to *Rome*, where he receives the Imperial Crown from his Holineſs's Hands; and ſo the Emperor returns to *Germany*. But this Sunſhine is ſoon overclouded by an accidental Occaſion. The Biſhop of *London*, in his Return from *Rome* through *Germany*, was ſet upon and robb'd, and barbarouſly uſed, by ſome Ruffians. The Pope hearing of this, writes to the Emperor, aggravating the Fact in the higheſt Circumſtances; tells the Emperor, the Sword was by God put into his Hands *for the Puniſhment of wicked Doers*: But that, inſtead of puniſhing them, he tells him he was ſaid to diſſemble and paſs it by, and to protect the ſacrilegious Ruffians. *Ib. p.* 1145. And a little further he puts the Emperor in Mind of Benefits received from the Apoſtolick See; of which, after having enumerated ſeveral general Ones which had been conferred on him by *Mater tua ſacroſancta Romana Eccleſia*, (I will be expreſs in the Words, becauſe there is very material ſubſequent Matter concerned in them) he a little further adds; *qualiter Imperialis inſigne Coronæ libentiſſimè conferens, benigniſſimo gremio ſuo tuæ Sublimitatis Apicem ſtuduerit confovere. Ibid.* Which Words, I think, cannot be more plainly render'd than thus, *viz. That Mother-Church, to ſhew how ſtudiouſly ſhe had deſigned to indulge his Highneſs, had moſt willingly conferred the Imperial Crown on him.* I am the more particular in theſe Words, becauſe we ſhall ſee the Editors make the Pope lay another Meaning on them. The reſt of this Epiſtle is of the ſame Piece: Which Epiſtle, ſays *Cabbaſutius*, *p.* 466. *col.* 2. and the Editors, *ib. p.* 1142. "was by the "Emperor and his corrupt Court taken in ſo ſiniſter a Senſe, that the Legates that brought them "were forced the next Morning to be gone to

"*Rome*,

" *Rome*, without ſtopping or calling upon any Bi-
" ſhop or Abbot in their Way. Nor did the Em-
" peror delay to ſend his circular Letters to the
" Princes, States, and Biſhops of the Empire, in
" which, (ſays he) concealing the true Cauſe of
" the Pope's Embaſſy, he complains, that Pope
" *Adrian* had ſent Legates to him with Letters, ar-
" rogantly expoſtulating with and upbraiding him,
" that he had received the Empire from none but
" the Pope; declaring, that he held the Empire
" and Kingdom of God alone by the Election of
" the Princes, and that he would die before he
" would bear ſo ſcandalous a Reproach; at the
" ſame Time forbidding any of his Subjects to go
" to *Rome*." The Quarrel being brought to this Height by the deep Reſentment of the Emperor, and the ſubtile Encroachment of the Pope, the latter is forced to give his Words another Meaning, which in his Epiſtle to the Biſhops of *Germany* and *Gaul* he does very expreſly, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1146. " He took thoſe Words, (*Inſigne, videlicet, Coronæ*
" *Beneficium, tibi contulimus*) ſo ill, that he re-
" proached us, *&c.*" And, ſays *Cabbaſutius*, *ibid.* the Pope fearing a dangerous Schiſm, deſired his Friends to uſe the moſt mild Means they could to ſoften his Temper, and reconcile him; declaring, That by *conferring the Imperial Crown on him*, he did not mean as if the Emperor owed any feudal Acknowledgment to him, or that by conferring the Imperial Crown on him, he meant it as a Gift from himſelf, but only that he was the ceremonial Inſtrument in putting it on his Head, and conſecrating him to the Imperial Dignity. This is the Truth of the Matter: The Pope could no more be ſaid to be the Diſpoſer of the Imperial Dignity, by ſetting the Crown on the Emperor's Head, than any other Biſhop can be ſaid to give a Crown

to

to the Prince on whoſe Head he puts it; but, with theſe Gentlemen's Leave, the Words in Pope *Adrian*'s Epiſtle to the Emperor carry a more abſolute Meaning; nor is it more than what the *Roman* Pontiffs before and ſince have claim'd. He reproaches the Emperor with Ingratitude for paſt Benefits, particularly that of *Conferring the Imperial Crown on him*. The Words cannot imply the Act of Crowning, or ſetting the Crown on his Head; (for that of Courſe would have been otherwiſe expreſs'd) but, by *Conferring*, here nothing can be meant but *conveying*, or *diſpoſing*; and thus the *Servus Servorum* became *Rex Regum*. And *Cabbaſutius*, *p.* 407. *col.* 1. plainly againſt his Will, inverts the Meaning and Senſe of the Word *conferre*, by ſaying, You muſt not take *dare Coronam* and *conferre* to be the ſame, (*tho' they are unqueſtionably ſo*) for *conferre*, in its full Force, ſignifies no more than *imponere Capiti*. But in this I appeal to the Cuſtom of all Countries, in which, I believe, without Exception, it will be allow'd, that the Perſon conferring is the Fountain, and conſequently Diſpoſer, of the Dignity, Honour, *&c.* diſpoſed. I have done with this Pope, who liv'd not to ſee an End of the Feud which he began, but left it to his Succeſſor, himſelf dying ſuddenly of a Squinancy, or, as ſome ſay, was choak'd with a Fly.

[1159.] His Succeſſor *Alexander* III. before called *Roland*, was elected Pope by Three and twenty Cardinals. He was, no Doubt, a faithful Creature and Confident of Pope *Adrian*'s, being ſent by him on two dangerous Embaſſies; one to *William* King of *Sicily*, and another to the Emperor *Frederick*, in the Caſe of the Biſhop of *London*; in the laſt of which he was but roughly treated. And therefore, upon the Death of Pope *Adrian*, the Emperor ſets up *Octavian* in Oppoſition to him, by

by the Name of *Victor* IV. by which a Schiſm commenc'd in the Church, which in his Time, and the two Anti-Popes his Succeſſors, *Paſchal* IV. and *Caliſtus* III. continued about One and twenty Years. *Alexander* III. being thus violently oppos'd, and by ſo powerful an Enemy as the Emperor, from whom he once narrowly eſcap'd with Life, finding himſelf in Danger at *Rome*, retires to a Place of greater Security. The Schiſm immediately burſt into an open Flame, and thundering *Anathema's* were iſſued from both Sides. The Year following the Emperor calls a Council at *Pavia*, where, in a handſome Speech to the Biſhops, he tells them, "That "tho' he was ſatisfied, by Vertue of his Imperial "Office and Dignity, he had Power to call a "Council when the Church was in Danger; (in-"ſtancing in the Caſes of *Conſtantine*, *Theodoſius*, "*Juſtinian*, and of later Days, *Charlemain* and "*Otho*) yet as to the Power of determining in "Matters of great Moment, he referr'd it to their "Prudence. Upon this the Emperor withdrew, and the Council declar'd in Favour of *Octavian*, condemning *Roland*. This Council is by the Editors inſerted, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1387. but with this Note of Diſtinction, that being call'd by an unlawful Power, it was of no Effect; and therefore Pope *Alexander* III. who was ſummon'd to it, wiſely declin'd appearing, alledging, That the Chief Biſhop was not to be cited by the Laity; That all Men ought to ſubmit to his Judgment; and that he was to be judg'd by none living; therefore he would not appoint a Legate to appear for him. As to the Election of *Victor* IV. according to what the Editors tranſcribe from *Radevicus* concerning the Acts of this Council, *ibid.* it looks fairer on *Victor*'s Side than on *Alexander*'s: For *Alexander* was choſen, according to the Editors, only by Three

and twenty Cardinals; which, according to the more modern Way of Electing, may look plauſible; but, according to the ancient Way of choſing by Clergy and People, *Victor*'s Election was more juſtifiable; for he was choſen by the Clergy and People, the Chancellor (*i. e. Alexander*) being preſent, and not contradicting it. The Editors likewiſe further add more plauſible Proofs in Favour of *Victor*'s Election, *ibid. p.* 1391. from the Emperor's Epiſtle to the Archbiſhop of *Saltzburg* and his Suffragans; but that which gives the greateſt Confirmation of the Juſtice of *Victor*'s Election, is the Epiſtle of the Preſidents of the Council of *Pavia*, ſign'd by the Patriarch of *Aquileia*, and Nine Archbiſhops; to which *Henry* II. King of *England* by his Ambaſſador conſented, (tho' afterwards that King was of another Mind, as will appear) as did the King of *Hungary*, the King of *Denmark*, the King of *Bohemia*, (who till this Emperor's Time was only Duke of *Bohemia*) and almoſt all the Princes of the *Roman* Empire, as well *Germans* as *Italians*; beſides a vaſt Number of Archbiſhops, Biſhops, Abbots, *&c.* The Epiſtle of the Biſhop of *Bamberg* to the Archbiſhop of *Saltzburg* is to the ſame Purpoſe, and ſo is that of the Canons of St. *Peter*'s at *Rome* to the Emperor: To obviate all which, the Editors produce only two Epiſtles of Pope *Alexander*'s, one to *Arnulph* Biſhop of *Liſieux*, and the other to the Archbiſhops and Biſhops of *England*; wherein, after Invectives, he chiefly inſiſts on the Juſtice of his own Election, by leſſening that of *Victor*'s, who, he ſays, was choſen but by Three of his Complices. (I ſuppoſe he means Cardinals, becauſe the Editors, *ibid. p.* 1185, ſay he was choſen only by Three Cardinals; but *Alexander* by Three and twenty.) By which, I think, it cannot be ſuppoſed but that he muſt mean, the Majority of Cardinals carry

carry an Election from all whatſoever. The reſt of the Epiſtle to the Biſhop of *Liſieux* is juſt the ſame Story the Editors tell of *Victor* out of *Radevicus*'s Acts of the Council of *Pavia*; which is no more than throwing Dirt on each other.

In the Year 1162, Pope *Alexander* III. being by the Emperor forc'd to leave *Italy*, he retires into *France*, the old Aſylum of diſtreſs'd Pontiffs, being invited thither by *Henry* II. of *England*, and *Lewis* of *France*; where in a Council he excommunicates his Rival *Victor*, and all Secular Princes who did not reſtrain Hereticks; and ſtrictly forbidding all Monks and Regular Canons the Practice of Phyſick and the Secular Laws.

The Year following, he calls a Council at *Tourain*, in which aſſiſted 17 Cardinals, 124 Biſhops, and among them *Thomas Becket* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* with his Suffragans, and 414 Abbots. In it the Acts of the Council of *Pavia* are reſcinded, and Pope *Victor* and the Emperor excommunicated.

Before I proceed further, I muſt beg Leave to take Notice of the Council of *Nazareth*, which was held in the Year 1160, upon the Occaſion of Pope *Alexander*'s ſending a Legate. The King of *Jeruſalem* was preſent at this Council; where, after it had been long debated, whether the Legate ſhould be allow'd to enter the Holy Land, and the Biſhops being divided, the King, with ſeveral Princes and Biſhops, fearing leſt the Church ſhould ſuffer by this Diviſion, perſuaded the Council to incline to neither Party; adviſing, That if the Legate would come as a private Perſon, he might be permitted, alledging the Danger of paſſing a Definitive Sentence in an uncertain Affair, a Schiſm being commenc'd, which as yet did not apppear to all the World; and urging beſides, that there was no

no Occaſion for a Legate in the Kingdom, to load the religious Houſes with Expences and Extortions. This was the King's Opinion; and his Jealouſy of the further Encroachments of the Biſhop of *Rome*, no Doubt, was juſtly grounded, as appears by his Advice to this Council to avoid any further Expence. It may, perhaps, be urged by the Friends of the Pontificate, that this was an ungrateful Return to the Supreme Biſhop, who at all Times was a ſtrenuous Promoter of proſecuting the War in the Holy Land: But certainly thoſe good Kings, whoſe Piety led them on to this Chriſtian Generoſity, did not intend, by driving out the Heathens, who prophan'd that Sacred Region, to plant a Colony for the Augmentation of the *Roman* Pontiff's Exchequer.

But notwithſtanding the King's Opinion, ſay the Editors, out of *Will. Tyrius*, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1404. *quæ licet utiliòr videretur*; the Party prevail'd, which was for receiving the Legate. Here they ſtop, and do not ſay, that the ſame Party agreed to ſend a congratulatory Epiſtle to Pope *Alexander* III. but ſubjoin one from *Almeric* and his Suffragans; which they in the Margin cite from *Tengnagel's veter. Monument.* the Authentickneſs of which I very much queſtion from the laſt Two Lines of it. The reſt of it is a general Recognition of Pope *Alexander's* Election, and Reprobation of *Victor*, whom with his Favourers having excommunicated, they voluntarily and unanimouſly accept of *Alexander* III. as their Temporal Lord and Spiritual Father, *in Dominum Temporalem & Patrem Spiritualem elegimus unanimiter, & voluntariè recepimus.* Certainly ſuch a Recognition in Temporals as this muſt be done very clandeſtinely, or the King of *Jeruſalem* would never have let it paſs. Nor had the Suburbicarian Region of the *Roman* Pontificate extended ſo far

Eaſtward, as to claim the Allegiance of a Temporal Prince's Subjects, with whom he had nothing to do. The Improbability of this with me invalidates the Authority of the whole Epiſtle.

The Council of *Lauden* is inſerted by the Editors, *A. D.* 1161, but with the greateſt Prejudice imaginable: For in the Beginning of their Account of it, they tell us, That *Otho Morena*, the Author of the *Lauden* Chronicle, (from whence they tranſcribe this Council) was a Favourer of the Schiſmatick Pope: And at the End of it they ſay to the ſame Purpoſe, *viz.* That this Author was in the Intereſt of the Antipope *Victor*, againſt the Catholick Pope *Alexander*. The firſt Thing done in this Council was the Recognition of Pope *Victor* by the Emperor, Nobility and Clergy, of both which there were great Numbers preſent; particularly the Patriarch of *Aquileia*, and the Archbiſhop of *Ravenna*. In this Council likewiſe were recited the Letters excuſatory of the abſent Kings of *Denmark*, *Norway*, *Hungary*, *Bohemia*, Six Archbiſhops, Twenty Biſhops, many Abbots, *&c.* which contained their Acknowledgment of Pope *Victor*, and that they would ſtand by whatever was determin'd by him in that Council. The other Part of this Council relates to the Inquiſition into the vileſt Act that Men can be guilty of one towards another. The Archbiſhop of *Mentz* was one of the Preſidents, who, according to the Editors, had ſubſcrib'd to the Acts of the Council of *Pavia* in Behalf of Pope *Victor* IV. and not only he, as has been obſerved before, but Nine Archbiſhops more, with their Suffragans. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1394. But the *Milaneſe* were for Pope *Alexander* III. in whoſe Cauſe they were ſo ſanguine, that they by ſome Means or other procured the Death of the Archbiſhop of *Mentz*: For which, in this Council, *Hubert*

bert Archbiſhop of *Milan*, with the Two Conſuls of *Milan*, the Biſhops of *Placentia* and *Breſcia*, with the Conſuls of both Places, and all their Accomplices, who were either actually guilty of or conſented to the Murder of the Archbiſhop of *Mentz*, are excommunicated, and other Biſhops depoſed and ſuſpended. This is a foul Story, and which the Editors, though they prejudice the Reader againſt the Author of the *Lauden* Chronicle, do not deny. But this Way of promoting any one to the Papacy by Murder did not begin here, many having before waded through Blood to St. *Peter's* Chair: Nor did it end here, for the ſame Method has too often been made uſe of ſince.

The Eighth *Lateran* Council of this Century, which was call'd by Pope *Alexander* III. is another Inſtance of the Biſhop of *Rome's* Encroachment on the Imperial Dignity: For the Pope returning to *Rome*, *A. D.* 1167, he is forced from thence by the Emperor: But the Year following he attempts to repoſſeſs himſelf of *Rome*, and recovers it; where calling the foreſaid Council, he not only excommunicates the Emperor, but depoſes him; treats him with all the Contempt and Diſreſpect imaginable, calling him *German Tyrant*, Schiſmatick, *&c.* boaſts himſelf *conſtituted by God above all Nations and Kingdoms*, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1506. And, to ſtrengthen his own Intereſt the more, and diſtreſs the Emperor, he abſolves the *Italians*, and all others, from the Allegiance they had ſworn to him; forbidding all Prieſts whatſoever to aid him in his Wars, or adminiſter any Peace or Comfort to him, till he had by due Pennance reconcil'd himſelf. In which, ſay the Editors, from the Epiſtles LX. and others, of *John* of *Salisbury*, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1450. the Pope followed the Example of his Predeceſſor *Gregory* VII. who uſed the Emperor *Henry* IV. after the ſame

Manner, by condemning him in a *Roman* Council; which had its desired Effect, say they: And by this Act of Pope *Alexander* III. that Sentence seems to be confirmed by God in Favour of the Privilege of St. *Peter*. Thus Rebels, when they flie in the Face of their Sovereign, cloak their Villanies with Religion, and make God the Patron of their damnable Machinations and Practices.

In this Council, Pope *Alexander* delegates *Galdin* Archbishop of *Milan* with Authority to depose the Schismatick Bishops, as he calls them, and to restore the Catholicks to their Sees. Whereupon *Galdin* sends Two Nuncio's to the Prelate of the Church of *Lauden*, and other Prelates, Abbots, and Clerks, advising them to relinquish the Interest of Pope *Paschal* and the Emperor *Frederick*, and side with Pope *Alexander*; which if they refused to do, they were to be deprived *a Beneficio & Officio*. This struck them with a mighty Consternation; for most of them had sworn to maintain Pope *Paschal*'s Right; and besides, they had sworn canonical Obedience to *Albert de Merlin* Bishop of *Lauden*, at that Time, as they thought, a Catholick Bishop, and undepos'd; which Oath they could not in Honour cancel. Under this terrible Apprehension they meet and debate what was most expedient to be done. On the one Hand they conclude, that if Pope *Paschal* and the Emperor should succeed, their relinquishing their Obedience and Allegiance would draw a severe Resentment on them from both, and deprive them for ever of their Dignities. On the other Hand, if they should refuse to comply with the Commands of Archbishop *Galdin* and Pope *Alexander*, who in a great Measure were Conquerors in those Parts, and considering at the same Time the general Revolt of the Cities of *Lombardy*, they could expect nothing less than an utter

utter Extirpation and Expulſion. This was a ſhocking Dilemma; but they did not long labour under it, for Neceſſity and Fear prevailed againſt Reaſon. A Man that argues upon Principle ſoon reſolves in the Right; and though Neceſſity, with all the affrighting Conſequences, ſtares him in the Face, it cannot warp his honeſt Judgment, but he reſolutely determines to abide by his Duty, his only true Intereſt. Neceſſity is no Argument for any Man to comply with an unjuſt Act; in which both the Complier and Compeller have much to anſwer for. The former may move Compaſſion, but the latter will attract Hatred.

Pope *Alexander* III. puſhes on his good Fortune, and with the Help of the *Venetians* forces the Emperor to very diſhonourable Conditions of Peace; upon which he is abſolved from his former Eccleſiaſtick Cenſure. The Conditions indeed were diſhonourable in the End; for he was forced to proſtrate himſelf at the Pope's Feet, who, (good Man!) to ſhew his Humility, proudly ſet his Foot upon the Emperor's Neck, uſing the Expreſſion of the Royal Prophet: *Thou ſhalt walk upon the Baſilisk and Aſp; thou ſhalt tread the Lion and Dragon under thy Feet.* This was Humility with a Vengeance indeed, if to trample upon diſtreſſed Majeſty could be call'd ſo! The Editors, in their Hiſtory of the Third *Lateran* General Council, give this Part of the Story a very gentle Touch, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1504. for they only ſay, that the Emperor being defeated, and the *German* Princes reproaching him with the Schiſm he had occaſion'd, he began to repent; and throwing himſelf at the Pope's Feet, he obtained a firm and laſting Peace. Very modeſt truly! But not one Word of the proud Inſult of treading on the Emperor's Neck. But as ſilent as

they are pleaſed to be, in this, *Pariſ. Sabell.* and others, are not ſparing.

The Ambition of this Pope knew no Bounds: Though he had enough to do with the Emperor of *Germany*, yet at the ſame Time he engages in Controverſy with *Henry* II. King of *England*, where he had an Inſtrument in the Perſon of Archbiſhop *Becket*, fit for his Purpoſe. The Story is well known, and therefore I ſhall not dwell long on it. The haughty Inſults of the Pope, and the Pride of *Becket* ſupported by him, grew ſo intollerable, that nothing leſs than the Delivering up all the Cuſtoms and Uſuages in the *Engliſh* Church would ſatisfy their Ambition. The Style of the Pope's Letters to the King and Archbiſhop *Becket* on this Occaſion was very inſolent; and *Becket*'s was no way inferior to it. In his Tenth Epiſtle the Pope tells the King, *he uſurps the Power of Chriſt. Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1196. In the ſame Epiſtle he ſets the Example of *Saul* before him, who, for having reſerved Part of the Plunder of the conquer'd *Amalekites*, contrary to the Command of God, was caſt off by him, and another choſen in his Place in his Lifetime: And not only threatens the King, but his Poſterity likewiſe, with the Example of *Rehoboam*, who for the Sins of his Father, King *Solomon*, was depriv'd of his Kingdom. The King of *England*, conſidering the Uſage that ſeveral Princes had met with from the Biſhops of *Rome*, and not inferior to what they threaten'd him with in the Two foreſaid Examples, had Reaſon to believe Pope *Alexander* would be as good as his Word: He therefore endeavours a Reconciliation; but *Becket*, without a plenary Conceſſion of all the Pope's Demands, will liſten to nothing. Continuing thus inflexible in his Reſolution, and perſiſting to attack the King's Authority, and the known Laws of the Land, with

an

an insupportable Obstinacy, he is by common Consent banished the Kingdom. At Six Years End he is restor'd to his See; but continuing his former Insolencies, he is assassinated; and in the Year 1173, he is canoniz'd by Pope *Alexander* III. Archbishop *Becket* being thus sainted, the Pope acquaints the Monks of *Canterbury* with it by Letter, *ibid. p.* 1226. wherein, after much Praise of his Merit, he exhorts them *to implore his Interest with God for the Salvation of the Faithful, and Peace of the universal Church.* This is a violent Encroachment on the Office of our Blessed Advocate Jesus Christ, whom St. *John* in his First Epistle, *c.* 2. *v.* 1, 2. calls Advocate and Propitiation for our Sins, and of the whole World. With what Authority the Bishop of *Rome* could invest a departed Soul, though canoniz'd here below, with such a Power in Heaven, I cannot see; but he that will assume such a Power, will not fail to defend it. As for Archbishop *Becket*, he had highly provok'd the King by his Contempt and other Actions, unbecoming the Character he bore; which drew the Odium of the whole Nation upon him; but none of this could deserve the severe Treatment he met with at last. The Manner of his Death was barbarous and sacrilegious; and, if the King were conscious of it, his whole Life could not have been a sufficient Attonement for it; but however it was, *A. D.* 1171, the King did publick Pennance.

This Pope having thus carried his Point in *England*, though at the Expence of *Becket*'s Blood, resolves not only to maintain his Ground in this Part of the Island, but likewise further Northward, where he had some Time before gain'd Footing. Accordingly he lords it over the King and Bishops of *Scotland*, where he claims the Right of Investitures, as if his Predecessors had fix'd them

in the Apoſtolick See ſome Centuries before; turning out *Hugh*, whom the King had made Archbiſhop of St. *Andrew*'s, excommunicating him for intruding into that See, and commanding all the Biſhops of *Scotland* to ſhun him as an excommunicated Perſon, until the ſaid *Hugh* had made Satisfaction to the Biſhop and Church of St. *Andrew*, and others, whom he had injur'd. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1240. And in the ſame Page there is an Epiſtle of this Pope's to *William* King of *Scotland*, written in the moſt arrogant Style of any Thing hitherto. The Caſe was this: The King of *Scotland* had, by Vertue of his Regal Power, diſplac'd *John* Biſhop of St. *Andrew*'s, and ſubrogated *Hugh* in his Room: But *Alexius*, the Pope's Legate, had depoſed *Hugh*, and by his Order confirmed *John* in the See of St. *Andrew*'s. Upon which Occaſion the Pope writes to King *William*, and commands him to ſuffer *John* Biſhop of St. *Andrew*'s to enjoy his Biſhoprick quietly, or elſe he would excommunicate both him and his Kingdom, peremptorily reſtraining the King to the Space of Twenty Days after the Receipt of his Letters, to eſtabliſh firm Peace and Security to Biſhop *John*; adding moreover, that if he perſiſted in his violent Reſolution of diſturbing him, whereas he had ſtudied to ſet his Kingdom at Liberty, he would now make it his Buſineſs to reduce them to their former Subjection. *Ibid. p.* 1241.

The Sixty firſt Epiſtle, to *Richard* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, and his Suffragans, about the Peace between him and the Emperor *Frederick*, is a Piece of meer Vanity and Oſtentation, and not as he would have it be thought, a Piece of Devotion; for he proudly values himſelf upon the Emperor's Submiſſion, who he ſays did as his Anceſtors had done. It's true indeed, ſome Emperors have been forc'd

to

to a very abject Condition by the Popes, and have made great Conceſſions and Submiſſions to the Biſhop of *Rome*; but Pope *Alexander* III. was the firſt that ever treated a Sovereign Prince in ſo vile and brutal a Manner as to ſet his Foot upon his Neck. His Holineſs is indeed ſo modeſt as to take no Notice of this ſervile Treatment of the Emperor in either of his Epiſtles to the two *Engliſh* Archbiſhops; but in that to *Roger* Archbiſhop of *York*, and *Hugh* Biſhop of *Durham*, he expreſſes ſomething very near it; for, after he has told them of the Manner of the Emperor's Submiſſion, of his giving him the Kiſs of Peace, and how the Emperor perform'd the Office of a Gentleman-Uſher in conducting his Holineſs into the Church; "After we "perform'd the Solemnity of Maſs, ſays he, he "conducted us to the Church Gate; where, as we "mounted our Palfry, he held the Stirrop, and "paid the uſual Honour and Reſpect to us which "his Predeceſſors had paid to ours." *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1246. This cannot be ſo eaſily proved as ſaid; for till this very Emperor, *viz. Frederick Barbaroſſa*, it was never heard that any Pope had exacted ſuch Obedience from any crown'd Head as that of holding the Stirrop, or proſtrating their Necks at the Pope's Feet; this very Emperor being the firſt that officiated as Groom of the Stirrop to the Biſhop of *Rome*, and that was to Pope *Adrian* IV. ſo that his Holineſs was very much beſides his Infallibility to ſay that theſe Submiſſions were according to Cuſtom, which never had been known before this Emperor's.

The 71ſt Epiſtle of this Pope to *Lewis* VII. King of *France*, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1336. *Append.* II. plainly demonſtrates, that though the Biſhop of *Rome* had throughout *Germany*, *Italy*, *Sicily*, and other Parts, after long Struggling, wreſted the Right of Inveſtitures

veſtitures out of the Hands of the Secular Princes; yet he had not gained ſo far upon *France*; for Archbiſhop *Becket* being grown ſo troubleſome to King *Henry*, that there was a Neceſſity for removing him; the Pope, who had all along fomented this Pique, and promoted this Miſunderſtanding for his own Intereſt, writes to the King of *France*, deſiring him, that if there were any Biſhoprick or Abbey void in his Kingdom, that he would beſtow it on Archbiſhop *Becket*, for the Support of him and his Followers, who would rather ſacrifice all they had than conſent to the Detriment of the Pope or the Church. Had the Biſhop of *Rome* at that Time had the ſame Power in *France* that he had in the Countries above-mentioned, and for which he was at that Time contending in *England*, he had not been oblig'd to court the King of *France* to what he otherwiſe would have commanded: They never write in a ſupplicant Style where they know they have Power; 'twas always below a Biſhop of *Rome* to ſue, their Style is lofty and threat'ning, and thundering out Anathema's upon the leſt Refuſal or Denial.

A. D. 1160, or as ſome will, 1170, the *Vaudoies*, *Albigenſes*, *&c.* began to appear; who ſoon ſpread over moſt Parts of *Europe*; particularly in *Germany*, *France*, and *England*. It is certain that they began before the Year 1170, becauſe in the Year 1160 they came over into *England*, where in a Council held at *Oxford* they were condemned. The firſt conſiderable Appearance of them was at *Lyons* in *France*; where, in a great Crowd of People, one of them dying ſuddenly, the reſt were mightily frighted; but eſpecially *Peter Waldius*, who immediately ſold what he had, and gave to the Poor. Upon this great Multitudes flock'd to him, to whom he expounded the New Teſtament in the vulgar Tongue,

Tongue, and taught Orthodox Doctrine relating to Faith and Morals. As to the Soundneſs of Principles and Doctrine of theſe People, nothing ſhews more of them than their ſtrict and regular Life; of which, notwithſtanding their Malice, *Æneas Sylvius*, afterwards Pope *Pius* II. in his *Hiſt. Bohem. cap.* 35. *p.* 103. and before him *Reinerius Sachonus*, who lived in the Middle of the 13th Century, in his *Summa de Catharis*, *c.* 45. *&c.* ſpeak very favourably. The latter of which, after he has diſtinctly enumerated the Errors of this Sect, which he calls *Blaſphemies*, he gives them the faireſt Character any Friend ever could beſtow on them; and therefore, whether they deſerv'd the Name of *Blaſphemers*, let the Impartial judge. " This Sect, ſays " he, are a People of great Piety, living very juſtly " and honeſtly before all Men, and believing or- " thodoxly of God, and all the Articles contain'd " in the Creed, only they blaſpheme the Church " of *Rome* and her Clergy." Here was the Sting that gall'd them, and the Source of thoſe poor People's Miſeries. They ſlighted the modern Opinions, condemn'd the corrupt Practices, and ſeverely reprehended the Superſtition and Tyranny of the Church of *Rome*. Theſe Things created them many Enemies every where, inſomuch that at laſt, in the 3d General *Lateran* Council, *A. D.* 1179. under *Alexander* III. they were condemned, where Can. XXVII. they were not only excommunicated themſelves, but all People were forbid, under Pain of Excommunication, to entertain them in their Houſes, or any where elſe, or to have any Dealing or Converſation with them. Being thus ſeverely dealt with, they diſpers'd themſelves into ſeveral Countries, providing for themſelves as well as they could.

Since

Since we have once more touch'd upon this ſame *Lateran* Council, it will not be improper to take Notice how careful Pope *Alexander* III. was to ſecure the Right of Election of the Biſhop of *Rome* in the *College* of Cardinals for the future, wholly excluding every Sort of People elſe; the Method of Election being ſet down in the firſt Canon, *viz.* "That he ſhould be acknowledg'd for Pope, "who was choſen by *Two Thirds* of the Cardinals, "and that if any one ſhould inſiſt upon his being "choſen by One Third, and ſhould uſurp the "Name of Biſhop, both he and they that receiv'd "him ſhould be excommunicated, *&c.*" The Second Canon makes void all Elections of the Antipope *Victor* IV. and other Schiſmatick Biſhops, and reverſes all Alienations by Invaders, *&c.* There is no Abjuration in this Canon, but in the Hiſtory of this Council, *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1505. the Editors have inſerted the very Form of it, which all the *German* Biſhops, and thoſe of other Provinces, were oblig'd to take, upon their being receiv'd into the Unity of the Catholick Church by Pope *Alexander* III. In this Form, after they have renounc'd all Hereſy againſt the Holy Catholick *Roman* Church, particularly the Schiſm of *Octavian*, *Guido*, *&c.* they ſwear Obedience to the Church, the Pope, and his lawful Succeſſors. The Oath to the Church is in a Canonical Senſe, but to the Pope they ſwear in both Senſes, *i. e.* Eccleſiaſtical and Civil; *Me obediturum juro, & promitto Fidelitatem Sanctæ Romanæ Eccleſiæ, & Domino meo Alexandro.* Which laſt Words include a Temporal Sovereignty; for if it had been meant only in an Eccleſiaſtical Senſe, it would have been *Domino Alexandro*, not *Domino meo Alexandro.*

To this Council the Editors have very unneceſſarily tack'd an Appendix from *Bartholomew Laurens*, con-

conſiſting of 48 Parts, each Part containing many Chapters; of which the firſt only relates to this Council, the reſt being foreign to it, as the ſame *Bartholom.* in his Preface to it owns, many of them belonging to other Popes long after *Alexander*'s Time. In ſhort, they are nothing but a Collection of Papal Decrees, publiſh'd as well before as after this Council, and therefore improperly plac'd here.

[1181.] *Lucius* III. before called *Humbald*, is choſen Pope in the Room of *Alexander* III. according to the Form preſcrib'd by the *Lateran* Council, *i. e.* by Two Thirds of the Cardinals. Of whom there is little ſaid by the Editors: But the Council of *Verona*, which was held *A. D.* 1184, ſhews as great an Inſtance of Prevarication in this Infallible Judge as Man could be guilty of. The Emperor *Frederick* coming into *Italy*, Pope *Lucius* goes out of *Rome* to meet him; (not ſo much out out of Reſpect, I ſuppoſe, as to prevent his coming to *Rome*; where he was not over deſirous of ſeeing any more Emperors) the Pretence was to confer with the Emperor about the Affairs of the Chriſtians in *Aſia*, which began to decline very much: However they meant on either Side, it's certain they met at *Verona*: To which Place great Multitudes of People flock'd from ſeveral Parts, eſpecially Eccleſiaſticks, who deſired the Reconciliation of the Apoſtolick See, and, as having follow'd the Emperor in a Schiſm, were ordained by Antipopes. The Emperor intercedes for them, as he had juſt Cauſe ſo to do, and deſires to have them receiv'd. To which the Pope very kindly conſents. But the next Day, when the People expected the Reconciliation by Impoſition of Hands, the Pope's Mind ter'd, urging, that according to the Council of *Venice* he could not do it; promiſing at the ſame Time to call

ano-

another Council in which that Matter ſhould be compromis'd. This was a very poor Evaſion for the Biſhop of the Firſt See to make, for the Council of *Venice* had no Relation to this Matter. In that Pope *Alexander* III. and the Emperor were reconcil'd, and the Antipope *Paſchal*, with thoſe he ordain'd, depoſed. What was this to *Lucius* III.? Here was the Emperor interceding for the Clergy that had ſided with him, and requeſting a Reconciliation for them; who were, no Doubt, convinc'd they were in the Wrong, by their earneſt Deſire of being reconcil'd. We'll allow their Crime was Schiſm. Should not then a true Father of the Church readily and chearfully have extended his Arms to embrace them upon their Return? Beſides, his urging the Council of *Venice* in his own Defence makes againſt him: For there the Emperor and Pope *Alexander* III. were reconcil'd; and therefore after Seven Years Space, (*viz.* from the Council of *Venice* to this of *Verona*) it was high Time that there was a Reconciliation, eſpecially when the Chief of this Breach had been receiv'd into Communion. The Editors, indeed, lay the Blame of the Pope's altering his Mind on *Conrad* Biſhop of *Mentz*, and the Biſhop of *Worms*, but give no Reaſon for it, and conſequently no Excuſe for the Pope, who had actually conſented to a Reconciliation at the Interceſſion of the Emperor; but the next Day flew from it. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1734, 1741.

The Firſt Epiſtle of this Pope, *ibid. p.* 1735. to the Biſhops and Clergy of *Scotland*, is as dangerous a Lecture for the Propagation of Rebellion as can be penn'd. The King of *Scotland* having been excommunicated by *Roger* Archbiſhop of *York*, by Order from Pope *Alexander* III. and his whole Kingdom put under Interdict; Pope *Lucius* III. abſolves them all; of which he gives Notice to the Bi-

Biſhops and Clergy of *Scotland* in this Epiſtle: "Wherefore, ſays he, the Excommunication and "Interdict being taken off, we command you by "theſe Apoſtolick Writings, freely and without "Scruple to communicate with him as a Catho-"lick Prince, and one that is in Communion with "the Apoſtolick See, and that you pay him all due "Honour. For the more ſincere we find him in his "Devotion to the Church and Eccleſiaſtick Perſons, "the greater Honour we deſire may be paid him in "all Things." By this it is plain, his Infallible Holineſs outdoes the old Republican Principle of making the Duty from Subject to King, and King to Subject, reciprocal and conditional, and that if the King fails on his Part, the Subject is free from his: For here, if the King diſoblige the Pope, or any Eccleſiaſtick, the Pope thunders out an Anathema againſt him immediately; that is, proclaiming throughout any Kingdom, That the King being excommunicated, the Subjects were abſolv'd from their Allegiance. This the latter Part of the Epiſtle aſſerts, and thence it's plain, that they make the Allegiance of Subjects but conditional; for the King of *Scotland* was to be honour'd by them, proportionably to his Reſpect to the Church and Church-men. This was no more than what had actually been committed by Popes of *Rome* and their Legates in the Southern Part of this Iſland but juſt before. The Clergy of *England* being grown ſo exorbitant, that they were frequently guilty of Murder, and other Enormities, King *Henry* II. no longer able to bear with them, lets the Laws looſe againſt them. Whereupon Archbiſhop *Becket* ſtands up reſolutely for the Immunity of the Clergy from the Civil Power; affirming, they owed not any Obedience but to the *Roman* Pontiff only. But of this Kind, we have al-

already named ſeveral Inſtances, and ſhall meet with many more e'er long.

[1185.] *Urban* II. before called *Lambert*, and *Gregory* VIII. before called *Albert*, *A. D.* 1187. have nothing remarkable ſaid of them by the Editors; but that they were very preſſing with the Chriſtian Princes to recover the Holy Land. Though neither of them came up to Pope *Clement* III. before called *Paulinus*, *A. D.* 1188, who, to perſuade People more readily to take upon them the Holy Croſs, promiſes them, by the Authority of God and the Holy Apoſtles St. *Peter* and *Paul*, Abſolution from all the Sins they had penitently confeſs'd. *Lab. T.* 10. *p.* 1752.

In this Pope's Time the forementioned Caſe between *William* King of *Scotland* and him is reviv'd, concerning the Biſhoprick of St. *Andrew's*; to which Pope *Alexander* III. had preferr'd *John*, and the King *Hugh*; who inſiſting on the King's Right of Preſentation, obſtinately keeps Poſſeſſion: Upon which this Pope writes to King *William*, taxing *Hugh* with Contumacy in refuſing to obey his Citation; and, in a different Style to what Pope *Alexander* III. wrote, uſes many ſoft Words and Entreaties, putting him in Mind of the Reverence and Duty he owes to the Apoſtolick See: But, it ſeems, he could not yet prevail, by the Epiſtle he writes on the ſame Argument to *Henry* II. King of *England*; entreating him to uſe his Intereſt with the King of *Scotland* in this Caſe, to perſuade him to a Compliance; and, if he could not prevail by fair Means, to compel him by Force. *Ibid. p.* 1755. By ſuch Ways as theſe have the Biſhops of *Rome* maintain'd their Uſurpations over diſtant Churches; tho', conſidering how ill King *Henry* had been treated by his Predeceſſor *Alexander* III. this Pope had little Reaſon to expect the King of *England* ſhould

eſpouſe his Intereſt; but the Biſhops of *Rome* never valued how unjuſtly they engaged Princes in War, if they promoted but their Ends. By what Means this Buſineſs was determin'd does not appear plainly from the Editors; but by this Pope's Fourth Epiſtle to *William* King of *Scotland*, it looks as if he had carried his Point for *John*, whom he had made Biſhop of St. *Andrew*'s. The Church of *Scotland* had hitherto been ſubject to the Primacy of *York*; but Pope *Clement* III. exempts the Biſhops of *Scotland* from all Obedience to the See of *York*; adding, that for the future none but ſuch as were Subjects of the Crown of *Scotland*, (except whom his Holineſs ſhould appoint) ſhould exerciſe the Office of Legate there. Whether by theſe Means or not this Matter was compos'd, I will not ſay; though it looks very probable: But if it were ſo, all that can be made of it is this; the See of *York* loſt a great Branch of her Primacy, and *Scotland* gain'd nothing by it: And the whole ſhews the Encroachment of the Pope more than his Juſtice.

Unleſs the Editors had a Mind to make this Pope as infamous as any of his Predeceſſors, they would not have mention'd the following Story of him. *William* King of *Sicily* dying without Children, his Kinſman *Tancred* claims the Kingdom, and raiſes a civil War: To extinguiſh which, King *Henry* (afterwards Emperor, his Father being gone to the Holy-Land) in Right of his Wife *Conſtantia*, the next Heir to the Kingdom, [*Hæredem Regni proximiorem, ib. p.* 1753.] ſends an Army into *Italy*; which, after much Miſchief done to the Rebels, [*cum plurima damna Rebellibus intuliſſet, ib.*] return'd to *Italy re infectâ*. And the Reaſon of this is very plain from the following Words: *Pontifex Tancredo favens ei Inveſtituram Regni dedit*: "The Pope favouring *Tan-*
" *cred*, beſtowed the Inveſtiture of the Kingdom

" on him." Here was the moſt open Injuſtice that could be practis'd ; for they own that the Emperor's Wife *Conſtantia* was the next Heir to the Crown, calling thoſe that oppoſed her Forces, Rebels ; and yet have the harden'd Front to ſay, that the Pope, favouring the Invader *Tancred*, inveſted him with the Kingdom. What they mean by ſtigmatizing their Pontiffs of *Rome* with theſe Marks of Infamy, I cannot imagine ; except by them they would have the World believe, that their lawleſs unbounded Supremacy can commend every Thing. They muſt be wretchedly infatuated with wild Notions of Ambition, who found the Right of Supremacy upon the Power or Opportunity of doing a great wicked Action.

[1191.] Pope *Celeſtine* III. before call'd *Jacinth*, ſucceeds ; whoſe Character is much better with the Editors than his Predeceſſors: (Not that they blame them for the vile Actions before-mentioned.) But *Baronius*, like the Editors ſometimes, will be doing, though it be Miſchief, otherwiſe he might have left out that Paſſage in his Annals, *ad An.* 1191. where he ſays: The ſame Year that Pope *Celeſtine* was conſecrated, King *Henry* VI. came to *Rome*, where he was inveſted with the Imperial Crown by the Pope, who (like others of his Predeceſſors, to ſhew his Humility) kick'd the Crown off his Head, ſignifying hereby that he had Power to depoſe him, if he deſerv'd Ill from him. This was a very odd Emblem, and the Manner of it as unſeemly : But it muſt be a very barren Fact indeed, that the Editors or their Friends, with their fertile Ingenuity, cannot raiſe ſome Advantage from. Had the Emperor reſented ſuch a brutal Action, as with Juſtice he might, he had been a Heretick, Schiſmatick, and what not ; but if his Holineſs commits the greateſt Outrage, foments the moſt unna-

unnatural Rebellion, *&c.* if he miſcarries he is a Saint; and though he dies in the Fact, is a Martyr.

[1198.] Cardinal *Lotharius*, in Imitation of his Predeceſſors, under the Name of *Innocent* III. mounts the Pontifical Throne, and cloſes this Century with as remarkable an Action as his Predeceſſors had begun it. His Firſt was a Magiſterial Attempt upon the Imperial Dignity, to ſhew his Supremacy over that and other Crowns, which he would have the World believe held of the Court of *Rome*. He was indeed in the Strength and Vigour of his Age, being but Seven and thirty Years old when he was promoted to the Papal Dignity. His whole Pontificate was a continued Series of Pride, attended with moſt ſordid Avarice; which *Matthew Paris, ad Ann.* 1213. *p.* 245. very wittily expreſſes; where, ſpeaking of King *John* of *England*, he ſays, *He knew by Experience, that the Pope was proud and ambitious above all Mankind, and inſatiably thirſty after Money, for the Sake of which he was very flexible and inclinable to all Manner of Wickedneſs.* This is a black Character indeed, conſidering from whom it came; but as black as it is, his Holineſs verified it to a Tittle. The Firſt Inſtance of exerting the Papal Supremacy was in the Caſe of *Otho* and *Philip*, the Two Competitors for the Empire; for the former of which he declared, who receiv'd the Imperial Crown from his Hands, with the uſual Benediction and Solemnity, at *Aix la Chapelle* in *Germany*. This was a ſhameful Act of Injuſtice in the infallible Judge; for *Philip* had not only a fairer Claim by Right of Inheritance, (being Brother to the Emperor *Henry* VI. whereas *Otho* was very diſtantly related, (if at all) being Son to *Henricus Leo* Duke of *Saxony*) but he was likewiſe duly elected according to the Conſtitution by the Princes

of the Empire. However, his Holineſs breaks through Right, Conſtitution, Obligation, or any Thing that lies in his Way; and to incapacitate poor *Philip* the more, he excommunicates him, and all that ſhould adhere to him, or his Intereſt; which ſoon had its deſired Effect; for though *Philip* was crown'd at *Mentz*, he was forc'd to quit his Claim, being deſerted by all upon the Pope's thundering out his *Anathema* againſt him. But this Sunſhine of the Pope's upon his Favourite *Otho* is ſoon obſcured; as ſhall be obſerved in its proper Place.

In the Year 1199, the People of *Metz* having for ſome Time, in Imitation of *Peter Waldi* and the *Vaudois*, practiſed the Reading of the Scriptures in the vulgar Tongue, were by Pope *Innocent* III. forbid the Uſe of them after that Manner. Thus was Popery advanced by the Suppreſſion of Religion; and the Word of God in a great meaſure extinguiſh'd, leſt by the Light of it, the vile Artifices of the Court and Biſhop of *Rome*, with their unjuſtifiable Practices, ſhould be detected. This ſame Year, beſides *Philip*, *Marchobald* King of *Sicily*, and *Philip* King of *France*, were excommunicated by Pope *Innocent*; the latter of which not ſubmitting to a Divorce from his Wife, the Pope adds to his Sentence, by laying his whole Country under an Interdict of religious Worſhip; which Sentence was confirm'd by the Councils of *Dijon* and *Vienna* in *France*, but taken off the next Year in the Synod of *Nivelle*; and the Caſe of this King's Matrimony being argued the ſame Year in the Synod of *Soiſſons*, the Matter was drop'd.

[1200.] We are now arrived at the Thirteenth Century, famous for the many and remarkable Things tranſacted in it. In this Age, SCHOOL-DIVINITY, which before had but barely been introduc'd, gain'd firm Footing. In the more ear-

ly Ages of the Church, the Apoſtles, and thoſe holy Apoſtolick Men their Succeſſors, delivered that pure and genuine Doctrine which they had received from our Bleſſed Lord, in a Method plain and eaſy, and accommodated to the meaneſt Capacity; avoiding thoſe Perplexities which attend litigious Diſputes, except when Neceſſity required a more minute Way of arguing in Defence of the Faith againſt the Gentiles and Hereticks. In the Inſtructing of their Catechumens, or Novices in Chriſtianity, they uſed a ſhort Form of Profeſſion of their Faith, containing the Heads of Evangelical Learning; which they more at large explained in their Sermons. Of this Sort were thoſe admirable Catechetical Lectures of St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem* and St. *Gregory Nicen.* together with the proper Homilies, which contain'd an Expoſition of ſome Part of the Old and New Teſtament, or ſome practical moral Doctrine. But when this Primitive-Eccleſiaſtical Purity and Simplicity grew into Diſuſe, they ſet up a more ſublime and ſubtile Way of Reaſoning; which was chiefly taken from *Dionyſius* the Sham-Areopagite in the latter Part of the Fourth Century. But it is moſt certain, that about the Middle of the Eighth Century, *John Damaſcene* the *Syrian* was the Firſt that gain'd *School-Divinity* that Preheminence, which it for many Ages maintain'd in the *Greek*, and afterwards in the *Latin* Church. It was he that brought Theology to that nice and accurate Method, diſtributing his Notions under proper Heads, as appears in his Four Books, *De Fide Orthodoxa.* In the Firſt of which he treats of the Unity and Trinity of the Godhead, with its Nature and Properties. In the Second, of the Creation, and the ſeveral Kinds of Creatures. In the Third, of the Incarnation of the Word, and the perſonal Union of both Natures; of the

Life, Death, and Descent of Christ into Hell. In the Fourth, of the Resurrection and Ascension of Christ; of Faith, and the Sacraments; of Reliques and Images; of the Law of God, Sabbath, Circumcision, and Antichrist, and of the Resurrection of the Flesh. Several of which are tender Points: And though he, and other School-Divines since, have spun their Notions of them very fine, they are rather amusing than instructing: And to acquire Applause to themselves, they have too often render'd that difficult and obscure which in it self is plain and easy. Besides, the Enquiring into and Defining the Nature of Mysteries, borders so very near upon prophaning them, that it is very much to be feared, the Looseness of the later Ages is in a great Measure owing to their busy Curiosity; or, I fear I have too much Cause to say, their Vanity in shewing their own Abilities. But how fond soever the *Greek* Church was of these Notions, it's certain, that in the *Latin* Church they were not entertain'd for near 400 Years after; *Lanfranc* Archbishop of *Canterbury* being said by some to have been a great Encourager of School-Divinity, though this scarce appears by his Works. *Peter Abailard*, in the Beginning of the Twelfth Century, and *Peter Lombard*, about the Middle, carry it on in the same Steps *Damascene* had begun; so that by this Time Theology had put on quite another Aspect, her Arguments restrained to a Philosophical Method, and the Thread of Reasoning drawn so fine, that it was as unintelligible as it was invisible. *Peter Lombard* is followed by a vast Train, *viz. Alexander Hales*, *Thomas Aquinas*, *Albertus Magnus*, *&c.* who, having quitted the more plain and pure Doctrine of the Ancients, betake themselves wholly to *School-Divinity*, and the *Aristotelian* Philosophy; and that not from the *Greek* Origi-

Originals, but from the imperfect Traditions of the *Arabians*; being generally taken from Verſions ill done, and worſe underſtood. However, by this they made their Way; and Primitive Divinity was ſo far laid aſide, that inſtead of the Authority of St. *Paul*, *Ariſtotle* keeps the Chair, and is become the ſole Moderator in all Theological Diſputes. A melancholy Face of Things! But for what End this *School-Divinity* was ſtarted, and how it has anſwer'd the Eſtabliſhment of the Papal Majeſty, the Reader may obſerve from *Damaſcene* the Founder, (who was the great Champion of Image-Worſhip, *A. D.* 730.) and the reſt of the Schoolmen; all or moſt of which were eminent in their Times for maintaining and defending the Encroachments and Uſurpations of the Court and Biſhop of *Rome* in Temporals as well as Eccleſiaſticks. There are ſeveral Things relating to this Century, of which ſomething might in a general Proem be ſaid; but I ſhall take them according to their Series of Time.

This Century begins with the Council of *Paris*, *A. D.* 1201. in which, one *Evrard* a Knight, whom *Henry* Count of *Nevers* had made Preſident of his Eſtate, was accuſed of the *Bulgarian* Hereſy. He was a Man of great Ability in State-Affairs, but an Oppreſſor of thoſe under him, ſay the Editors, *T.* 11. *p.* 24. *par.* 1. (ſo eaſy is it to take an Occaſion of quarrelling with thoſe we hate!) However, he is ſummoned to appear before the Pope's Legate in Council, where he is condemned of Hereſy, and ſentenc'd to the Flames, to expiate his Crime; being firſt delivered to his Maſter, Count *Henry*, to make up his Accounts, and afterwards to the Executioner at *Nevers*, where he accordingly ſuffered. Here was the Beginning of Propagation by *Fire and Fagot*.

The ſame Year the Editors pretend a Council in *Scotland*, about the better celebrating the Lord's-Day, but name no Biſhop or Legate preſiding in it, or any Perſon to give the Colour of a Synod to it, only *Euſtachius*, Abbot *de Flay*. But this was with no other Deſign than to propagate a ridiculous Legend of Lies, call'd the *Celeſtial Epiſtle*. This Abbot *de Flay* was a Man of a moſt holy Life, who perceiving the Looſeneſs of the Age in the Celebration of the Lord's-Day, made it his Buſineſs to travel through ſeveral Countries, to perſuade the People to a more ſtrict Obſervation of it; which was attended with many Miracles. That this *Celeſtial Epiſtle* is a Fiction, take *Coſſart*'s Word, *ibid. p.* 27. where, in his Note at the End of it, he ſays: "For what Reaſon *Binius* ſhould "intrude this Fiction of the *Celeſtial Epiſtle* into his "Collection of the Councils, and call it a Coun-"cil, I cannot ſee." It's certain, *Binius* never ſticks at any Thing, whether true or falſe, or ever ſo groſs, that will but anſwer ſome End; but then I think *Coſſart* might have ſav'd himſelf the Trouble of inſerting this ridiculous Fiction, if he had thought it ſuch, (as it's plain he does;) for by ſo doing he makes himſelf as fabulous an Editor as *Binius*. But this is no new Thing with them, (as has been before obſerv'd) for the very Forgeries and Fictions which they condemn as ſuch, have often been introduc'd at ſome Diſtance for genuine Authority; therefore whoever reads them muſt be upon his Guard.

A. D. 1206. a Council was call'd at *Reading* in *Berkſhire* by *Ferentine* the Pope's Legate. This the Editors take from *Matthew Paris*'s Annals, who is altogether ſilent of the Cauſe of its being call'd, or what was done in it: But to the ſame Year, *p.* 214. he adds, "That *Ferentine* having taken a

"*Tour*

" *Tour* through *England*, had gathered a vaſt Sum " of Money together, which he carefully diſpos'd; " and haſtening to the Sea-ſide, bid *England* adieu." But *Matthew Weſtminſter* is plainer in this Matter; for, *p.* 63. after having almoſt repeated *Matthew Paris*'s Words, adds: " After the Legate had heap'd " up a great Sum of Money, he held a Council, " leſt he ſhould be thought to do nothing." This was doing ſomething indeed: But as to the Council, it is plain it was but a Blind to cover the Legate's Errand; which was to raiſe Money, and not to hold Councils. It was, no Doubt a clandeſtine Act, otherwiſe the Legate, according to *M. Paris*, would not have been ſo ſollicitous in ſecuring the Money, and making ſo much Haſt out of *England*. The Editors having cited *M. Paris* for this Council, as aforeſaid, tell us, That *M. Weſtminſter* ſays the ſame; but wiſely leave out the Words, *That he held a Council, leſt he ſhould be thought to do nothing.* Notwithſtanding this mighty Maſs of Treaſure which *Ferentine* the Legate carried from *England*, Pope *Innocent* cannot forbear exerting his Authority further. About this Time he plays the Fury, reſolving to let crown'd Heads feel the Weight of his Univerſal Cenſure. Accordingly he thunders out his *Anathema's* againſt them, deprives *Philip* King of *France*, and abſolves his Subjects from their Allegiance, forbidding them, under Pain of moſt direful Curſes, to pay any Obedience to him. He uſes *John* King of *England* after the ſame Manner, for refuſing to admit *Stephen Langton*, whom he had nominated to the See of *Canterbury*; laying the whole Kingdom under an Interdict. Theſe are dreadful Inſtances of Tyranny in the Biſhop of *Rome*; but conſidering their vile and abject Treatment of ſeveral Emperors and Kings before, this is no more than what could be expected from them.

them. There was now no Power left in the Church to diſpute Superiority with them; for all Things there ſubmit to the arbitrary Sway of the *Roman* Pontiff: To ſecure which, he caſts a jealous Eye on the Civil Power of Secular Princes; and, under Pretence of Eccleſiaſtick Cenſure, terrifies them into a Compliance with his illegal exorbitant Demands and Encroachments; which, if they refuſe, he not only excommunicates them, but lays their Countries under his Interdict; and to make them ſtill more ſenſible of his Univerſal Sovereignty, he exhorts their Subjects to fly in their Faces, by abſolving them from their Duty, and forbidding them under ſevere Penalties to pay them Obedience. What Extravagancies will not Men commit when they give themſelves up to ungovernable Ambition and ſordid Avarice? What Seas of Blood, and immenſe Treaſures, have been expended in the Support of this wild Notion of Supremacy? How many crown'd Heads have bled under their execrable Reſentment; and what vile and unjuſtifiable Actions have been committed by their Partiſans to maintain this ill-gotten Sovereignty? That Meekneſs which our Bleſſed Lord and his Diſciples taught and practiſed, and commanded all, eſpecially the Paſtors of his Flock, to imitate, is by them turn'd into extream Cruelty; their very Prieſts, whoſe Office is to feed the Souls of God's People, turn'd into Ruffians and Aſſaſſines; and it has, more than once, been thought meritorious to take off a King that ſtood in their Way. Of what dangerous Conſequence theſe Examples have been, the Chriſtian World to this Time is ſenſible; eſpecially they who have too fatally felt the Proſecution of thoſe Principles, and that wretched Spawn of Sectaries which crawl'd from them, have given too many Inſtances of their Similitude to the

the Dam from whence they came, in perpetrating the ſame Facts under Pretence of ſerving God and his Church. But to return.

The Emperor *Otho* having by Pope *Innocent*'s Means obtained the Imperial Diadem, had not long been in Poſſeſſion of it, but he turns upon his Benefactor, refuſing to ſtand to the Oath and Terms upon which the Pope had inveſted him with the Empire. It was great Imprudence in *Otho* to contend with the ſupreme Infallible Judge, who ſoon made him ſenſible of his Temerity and Folly in offering to break with a Power that could as eaſily unmake as it had made him. His firſt Quarrel was with the *Romans*, who quickly drove him out of their City; upon which, contrary to the Pope's Mind, he ſeizes ſeveral Cities and Towns in *Apulia*, and adds *Sicily* to the reſt of his Conqueſts. The Pope admoniſhes him by Letters and Meſſengers, but to no Purpoſe. Had the Emperor fallen upon any other Country than *Sicily*, or what was a Feudal of the Church, the Pope had never quarrel'd with him. But as Pope *Innocent* III. in *Ep.* 188, and 189, to the Emperor, ſays, "If you forbear "the Patrimony of the Church, I ſhall ſhew no "Favour, or give Aſſiſtance, to *Frederick* or any "other, according to the Stipulation betwixt us; "but *Sicily* being Part of the Church's Patrimony, "I cannot but diſſuade and dehort you from in-"vading it; which if you perſiſt in, I ſhall main-"tain and defend by all poſſible Means; but you "muſt expect Excommunication." It's a Sign the Emperor *Otho* did not well know a Biſhop of *Rome*. He might have believed every Word he threatned him with; nay, might conſequently have expected worſe than he threatned. The Biſhops of *Rome* do not often make good their Promiſes in Favour of any but themſelves, but when they threaten any one,

one, they generally exceed their Word. This *Otho* found by fatal Experience, for he is no ſooner declared excommunicate, but he is depos'd, being on all Sides beſet with ſo many and powerful Enemies, and deſerted by his Friends, (For who dare oppoſe the Infallible Supreme ?) he retires to *Brunſick*, where he dies of Grief.

The Fourth General *Lateran* Council is by the Editors, in *Con. Tom.* 11. *Par.* 1. *p.* 117. introduc'd with a Hiſtory after the uſual Manner; wherein, they ſay, the Firſt Thing reſolved upon was a general Confeſſion of the Catholick Faith. Several pernicious Doctrines and Encroachments of the Church of *Rome* had been attempted in ſeveral Ages to be impoſed on the Catholick Church by the Biſhops of *Rome* and their Partizans; but none obtained ſo firm Eſtabliſhment and Confirmation as thoſe ratified in this Council, which here gain'd Footing, and to this Time have generally prevail'd. The Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* had for many Years been variouſly acknowledg'd and refuted, but active Pope *Innocent* III. reſolves to nail the Controverſy, and for the future to put it beyond Diſpute. In order to which, in the Firſt Canon of this Council, they conclude upon a Confeſſion of Faith, to be acknowledg'd by all, the former Part of which, relating to the Unity of the Trinity, General Reſurrection, *&c.* is Orthodox; but the latter Part makes *Tranſubſtantiation* an Article of Faith as much as any of the former in theſe Words: *The Body and Blood of Chriſt in the Sacrament is verily contained in the Bread and Wine; the Body by the Divine Power being chang'd into Bread, and the Blood into Wine; that, to compleat the Myſtery of the Unity, we might receive that from him which he took of us; viz.* by his Incarnation. The Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*

tiation has in all Ages, ſince it has been broach'd, been ſufficiently confuted and exploded; and therefore I ſhall not here diſſert upon it, only give this ſmall Animadverſion; *viz.* That it is as abſurd as it is profane, to make the Partakers of the Bleſſed Sacrament a Part of the Completion of the Unity; which, if granted according to this Article, is making Cannibals of Chriſtians. But as groſs as this Doctrine is, it is in the Third Canon inforc'd under Pain of Excommunication to all that refuſe it, and the like Puniſhment to thoſe that ſhall favour or protect the Recuſants, commanding all Archbiſhops, Biſhops, *&c.* to make ſtrict Search and Inquiry in their reſpective Diſtricts, and to charge the People upon Oath to diſcover ſuch Recuſants; and to ſignify the ſame to the Sovereign Pontiff, that they may be brought to condign Puniſhment; which if any Prelate ſhould neglect to do, he ſhall forthwith be depoſed, and a more fit Perſon be ſubſtituted in his Place. This was making ſure Work, and propagating Iniquity with a Vengeance.

The Second Canon condemns *Joachim* the Abbot for writing againſt the famous School-Divine *Peter Lombard*, whom he wittily explodes for making a Quaternity of the Unity and Eſſence of the Trinity, calling him Heretick and Madman. Here we may ſee the Effect of this ſublime and ſubtil Way of Reaſoning in the School-Men. *Joachim* thought himſelf as well qualified for this as *Peter Lombard*, or any of them; and therefore thinks he has an Advantage of him in his Aſperſion, with which he acquainted Pope *Innocent* III. and, no Doubt of it, he thought himſelf in the Right, and expected Applauſe from him, or he had not tranſmitted his Book to him for his Approbation,

tion, as this Canon ſays. But, whether his Aſſertion againſt *Lombard* were right or not, it is plain that this new Method of Reaſoning was attended with ill Conſequences, and, in their Senſe, inſtead of curing, created Hereſies. *Almerick* of *Chartres*, who had been condemned in the Second Council of *Paris*, *A. D.* 1209. with his Followers, was condemn'd in this Canon. He was well skill'd in Logick, and as good at Diſtinctions, Diviſions, and other Niceties, as the reſt; by which he broach'd ſeveral new Opinions, which his Followers vaſtly improv'd; for which, tho' dead, he is here condemn'd, and his Body taken up and burnt.

The Third Canon is a Confirmation of the firſt, as has been ſaid, with this Addition, chiefly to exert the Supremacy, as well in Temporal as Spiritual Cauſes; That if any Temporal Prince, being requir'd by the Pope to purge his Dominion of Hereticks, ſhall neglect ſo doing, he ſhall be excommunicated. And if within the Space of a Year he ſhall refuſe Satisfaction, Notice ſhall be given to the Pope; who, for his Contempt, ſhall abſolve his Subjects from their Allegiance, and give his Land to be poſſeſs'd by Catholicks, who, extirpating the Hereticks, ſhall enjoy it without Moleſtation: Adding this ridiculous Salvo, *Saving the Right of the Prince, ſo long as he ſhall not make any Oppoſition.* Neceſſity indeed has made many Sovereign Princes acquieſce under ſuch arbitrary Sentences, but he muſt be very phlegmatick that will ſubmit to ſuch unwarrantable Diſpenſations, when he hath Power to reinſtate himſelf in his own, and expell Invaders.

The Fourth Canon crowns all former Invaſions of the *Latins* upon the *Greek* Church, challenging Obedience from the *Greeks* to the Biſhop of *Rome* as their Sovereign. How vaſtly different this is

from the Uſage of the Primitive Church, the Second General Council of *Conſtantinople*, Can. 3. the Council of *Chalcedon*, Can. 28. and the Sixth General Council of *Conſtantinople*, Can 36. plainly demonſtrate; all which agree, that the Biſhop or Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* ſhould have equal Honours after the Biſhop of *Rome*. The Third Canon of the Council of *Conſtantinople* gives the Reaſon for this very expreſly; becauſe *Conſtantinople*, being the Seat of the Empire, was become *New Rome*. Which Biſhop *Beveridge*, in his Note on the 28th Canon of *Chalcedon*, further explains, (though the Canon it ſelf is plain enough, which ſays, "The "Biſhop of *New Rome* ſhall enjoy the ſame Honour "with the Biſhop of *Old Rome*, by Reaſon of the "Tranſlation of the Empire.)" From hence, ſays he, we may obſerve for what Reaſon the Ancients paid ſo much Honour to the See of *Rome*; not becauſe it was the See of St. *Peter*, or becauſe her Biſhop is Chriſt's Vicar; but becauſe it was the Seat of the Empire. But the Power, which the Biſhop of *Rome* had thus uſurp'd over the *Greek* Church, was chiefly owing to the diſtracted State of the Eaſtern Empire, their own Diviſions contributing to the Ruine of their Church and State: For *Alexius Aregalus* depriving his Brother *Iſaac* both of the Empire and his Eyes, the Chriſtian Princes, who were going with a great Force to recover the Holy Land, winter by the Way at *Conſtantinople*; where they beſiege the Uſurper *Alexius*, and take the City, from whence he eſcap'd. The City being taken, and the Uſurper fled, the poor blind Emperor *Iſaac* is by the Conſent of the Princes plac'd on the Throne. And now, all Things ſubmitting to the Will of the *Latin* Princes, Pope *Innocent* III. reſolves to improve the Opportunity, who immediately introduces the Worſhip of the

Latin

Latin Church in *Conſtantinople*; and, to ſecure the Inveſtiture of the Patriarchate for the future, makes one *Thomas* of *Venice* Patriarch. *Cabbaſut. Not. Eccleſ. p.* 413. *col.* 2. Before theſe Advantages, the *Greek* Church was ſo inveterate againſt the *Latins*, that they refuſed all Manner of Communion with them; inſomuch that, as is mentioned in this Fourth Canon, they would not celebrate upon the ſame Altars till they had waſh'd them, and rebaptiz'd thoſe that had been before baptiz'd by the *Latins*. But theſe proſperous Succeſſes of the *Latin* Princes, gave new Life to the Affairs of the Biſhop of *Rome*, who not only aſſumes Power over the Patriarchate of *Conſtantinople*, but over all the Patriarchates of the Eaſt, as appears from the Fifth Canon of this Council. In which he not only claims Supremacy over them, but pretends an antecedent ancient Right. This Canon is written with an Air of Sovereignty, and is worth the Reader's Notice; which is *verbatim* thus: "Being de-
" ſirous to revive the ancient Privileges of Patriar-
" chal Sees, with the Conſent of this Holy Uni-
" verſal Synod, we decree, That, after the Church
" of *Rome*, which, by the Providence of God, is
" ſupream above all others, as the Mother and So-
" vereign of all the Faithful of Chriſt, *Conſtanti-*
" *nople* be the Firſt, *Alexandria* the Second, *Antioch*
" the Third, and *Jeruſalem* the Fourth; allowing
" to each his Dignity in his proper Diſtrict; but
" with this Reſerve, that after their Biſhops had re-
" ceived their PALL from the Biſhop of *Rome*,
" (which is the Mark of Plenitude in the Epiſco-
" pal Office) and having ſworn Fidelity and Obe-
" dience to him, they might freely diſpoſe of the
" Pall to their Suffragans, receive their canonical
" Profeſſion for themſelves, and likewiſe the Oath
" of Obedience from them to the Church of *Rome*.

" They

" They ſhould alſo have the Crucifix carried be-
" fore them, but not in the City of *Rome*, or any
" Place where the Pope or his Legate reſided. In
" all Provinces the Right of Appeal upon Occa-
" ſion ſhould likewiſe be allow'd to them, except
" in Prejudice of the See of *Rome*, to which all
" ought to pay humble Deference.

Here indeed the ſupream Pontiff has exerted himſelf in a moſt lordly Manner, ſubjecting the Univerſal Church to his arbitrary Sway, and making all Dignities in it, (how independant ſoever they were of *Rome* before) to hold of him in moſt abject feudal Slavery; and that Primacy, which was but a meer complimental Deference paid to the See of *Rome* by other Biſhops in reſpect of her being the Firſt See, is turn'd into a Supremacal Tyranny, claiming ſervile Obedience from thoſe Prelates of other Parts of the Chriſtian Church who before were always eſteem'd equal to thoſe of *Rome*, the Biſhops of *Carthage*, particularly St. *Cyprian* and *Cæcilian*, calling them *Confratres*, *Coepiſcopi*, & *Collegæ*. But to let the World ſee in what Subjection Pope *Innocent* III. kept the Eaſtern Patriarchs, the Editors, in the Preamble to this Council, inſert Two of this Pope's Epiſtles: The Firſt is to the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, wherein, ſpeaking of his Intent to call a General Council, he imperiouſly commands his perſonal Appearance in his Preſence at the Time appointed; or, if he cannot, to depute his Repreſentative; he does not ſay Legate, for that is now become a Term proper only to the Supream Biſhop's Deputy. The other is written in the ſame lofty Style to the Patriarch of *Jeruſalem*, whom in the Tirle he calls *Legate of the Apoſtolick See*, requiring his Preſence likewiſe at the Council, if he can come without Detriment to the Affairs of the Holy Land, and to bring proper Per-

ſons with him to aſſiſt in it; but does not ſay, as to the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, if he could not come in Perſon, to depute ſome other in his Room; his ſagacious Infallibility wiſely foreſeeing, how prepoſterouſly it would look for his Legate to ſend a Sublegate. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 1. *p.* 129, 130.

But we'l return to the Fifth Canon aforeſaid, becauſe in it the Biſhop of *Rome* hath made but one Morſel of the Rights of the whole Chriſtian Church, which he hath gorg'd with a Vulturian Guſt. How unjuſt his Claim of Supremacy is, has been generally and particularly ſpoken to already. We have often mentioned the *Taking up of the Pall from* Rome; which, being another Innovation and Encroachment of the Grand Prelate, it may be of Uſe and Entertainment to the Reader to diſcuſs.

The PALL is the Characteriſtick Note, or Emblem of the Pope's Supremacy; for by Vertue of it all Patriarchs and Metropolitans, as they pretend, hold of *Rome*; and without it they are not to conſecrate, celebrate a Synod, or exerciſe any Pontifical Function. There is a ſhort Account of the Court of *Rome*, together with its Offices and Officers, written in *Italian*, tranſlated into *Engliſh* by Mr. *H. Cogan*, and printed for *Henry Herringman*, *A. D.* 1654, wherein the Tradition of the PALL is related, *p.* 141, *&c.* The Uſe of the PALL is there ſaid to be very ancient, having its Original from Pope *Linus*, the immediate Succeſſor of St. *Peter*, and given by God to the Prelates of *Rome* for a ſingular and ſpecial Privilege of Power. The Care of making and keeping the *Palls*, ſays the ſame Author, belongs to the Apoſtolical Subdeacons, who make them of pure and White Wool in this Manner: The Nuns of St. *Anne*'s Monaſtery do offer every Year two White Lambs on the Altar of that Church in the Feſtival Day of St. *Anne*,

of

of whoſe Wool the *Palls* are made, and delivered to the Subdeacons, who carry them to the Church of St. *Peter*; by the Canons of which they are laid upon the Bodies of the Apoſtles *Peter* and *Paul*, under the high Altar, and being watch'd one Night according to Cuſtom, they are taken from thence, and reſtor'd to the Subdeacons. The Form of them is orbicular, ſo as to compaſs the Shoulders, with Labels hanging down before and behind, and on each Shoulder. When the *Pall* is conferr'd on any one, theſe Words are Part of the Form: *To the Honour of Almighty God, of the Bleſſed Virgin* Mary, *and of the Bleſſed Apoſtles* Peter *and* Paul; *and alſo of our Holy Father the Pope, and of the Holy Church, we give thee this Pall, taken from the Body of Bleſſed* Peter, *wherein is the Plenitude of the Pontifical Office, together with the Title of Archbiſhop, &c.* Thus far the aforeſaid Author, on whom it will not be amiſs to beſtow an Animadverſion or two.

1. As to the Antiquity of the Inſtitution of the *Pall*, this Author deduces it from *Linus*, whom he calls the immediate Succeſſor of St. *Peter*. But this, as we have obſerved in the Beginning of theſe Remarks, could never clearly be made out, nor can the *Romaniſts* plainly prove who was the immediate Succeſſor of the Apoſtles in the See of *Rome*; for tho' *Irenæus* ſays, *The Apoſtles gave the Adminiſtration of the Church at* Rome *to* Linus; yet, as has been already obſerved, *Epiphanius*, *Hæreſ.* 20, gives the Reaſon for it, ſaying, *That the Apoſtles being gone into other Provinces to preach the Goſpel of Chriſt*, Rome *could not be left without a Biſhop*. And therefore they deputed *Linus*; which does not amount to a Succeſſion, but a bare Temporal Deputation. But it matters not to the preſent Purpoſe, whether SS. *Peter* and *Paul* made *Linus* the firſt Biſhop of *Rome*, whether he was the next in the Adminiſtration af-

ter St. *Peter*, or whether he died before St. *Peter*, as the Author of the Apoſtolick Conſtitutions has it, *l.* 7. *c.* 47. There is an unlucky Blunder in the Inſtitution it ſelf, which gives it a fatal Stab. The Author tells us, That the Care of making and keeping the *Palls* was committed to the Apoſtolical Subdeacons; and that they were made of the Wool ſhorn off the two Lambs offer'd on the Altar of the Church of St. *Anne*. Some People have but weak Memories ------ Let this Author prove, that there was ſuch an Order as that of Subdeacons in *Linus*'s Time, or that there then was any Monaſtry or Church dedicated to St. *Anne* in *Rome*, as he affirms, and I will without Scruple believe this or any other *Romantick* Story he or any of his Friends can invent, be their Fancy never ſo prolifick.

2. There is ſomething in the Form of the Collation of the *Pall* that carries a more modern Aſpect than that of *Linus*'s Time. For theſe Words, *We give thee this Pall, wherein is the Plenitude of the Pontifical Office*, are *verbatim* the Words of the Fifth Canon of the Fourth *Lateran* Council; and which I dare affirm were not uſed in this Senſe in any Inſtitution, Canon, or Council before, which is above 1100 Years after *Linus*.

3. This Author affirms, That *Euſebius Cæſarienſis*, in a Sermon of the Epiphany, writeth thus: *Nothing is more ancient than the Sacerdotal Veſture of our Prelates, which ſucceeded to that made of Silk and Gold in the Old Teſtament, wherewith* Linus *firſt of all was adorn'd, in Sign of plenary Power.* This ſmells ſtrong of the Forge for ſeveral Reaſons; 1. As to *Euſebius*'s Sermon on the Epiphany, as he calls it, he is very much beſides his Authority; for this muſt either be among his Five Books *de Theophania*, which are reckon'd among his *Opera non extantia*, and conſequently

ſequently could not come within this Author's Reach; being only known as being cited: Or elſe it muſt be among his Homilies, which are reckon'd among his *Scripta dubia*, and more juſtly eſteem'd to belong to *Euſebius Emiſenus*. *Cav. Hiſt. Lit. Par.* 1. *p.* 133, 134. 2. The Sacerdotal Veſture cannot be ſaid to imply a *Pall*, bearing no Relation to it. 3. The forementioned Phraſe, *Plenary Power*, carries Suſpicion enough to betray it.

Before I take Leave of this Author, there is another Thing worthy Obſervation; which however indulg'd or diſpens'd with, cannot clear the Church of *Rome* or its Biſhop from that foul Sin of direct Simony. The *Pall* being granted, *p.* 146. he adds, *They who receive it, do uſually compound with the Subdeacons, who do receive from the Prelates, ſometimes more, ſometimes leſs in the Hundred, according to the Value and Taxation of the Church.* So that according to their own Scheme, *viz.* That no Prelates can conſecrate, celebrate Synods, or perform any Epiſcopal Act, before they have taken up their *Palls*, and which cannot be obtained without a Price, they have no Title to their Dignities, and therefore muſt conſequently be guilty of Simony. It may be urg'd perhaps in Defence of the Supream Pontiff, that this Price is no more than a Fee due to the Subdeacons as Officials in the Court of *Rome*; but our Author clears that Point, by adding, that, *The Maſters of the Ceremonies too, in regard of their Office, and the drawing up of the Inſtrument, have certain Fees, according to the Proportion of the Value, and Taxation of the Churches, but not ſo much as the Subdeacons. Ibid.* The Maſters of the Ceremonies indeed ought to be conſidered for their Trouble in drawing up Inſtruments, and the Fees appropriated to them are as much their Due as a Labourer's Hire; but Subdeacons are not to be reckon'd in

the Number of Hirelings or menial Servants; and being Clericks, cannot give or take Money on the Score of any Eccleſiaſtical Promotion without Imputation of Simony.

But the honeſt Sorboniſt *Richerius*, in his Hiſtory of the General Councils, *L.* 1. *p.* 381. *&c.* makes this Encroachment of the Biſhops of *Rome* a much viler Uſurpation than has hitherto been repreſented, the Inſtitution of the *Pall* being not originally theirs. How unconformable to the ancient Canons the later and more modern Innovations of the See of *Rome* are, may be clearly evinc'd from the Canons themſelves. The Sixth Canon of the Firſt *Nicene* Council allots to each Patriarch his Rights over his Metropolitans; and that no Perſon ſhall be acknowledged a Biſhop who is not conſecrated by his proper Metropolitan. The Right alſo of Patriarchs ordaining Metropolitans is enforc'd from this and the Canons of other Councils, particularly that of *Chalcedon*, *Can.* 12. wherein the Rights of both are preſerv'd, which mediately or immediately is to be underſtood according to the Order preſcrib'd by the Canons, or other ancient prevailing Cuſtom. Now, ſays *Richerius*, the Manner of ordaining Metropolitans was by Impoſition of Hands; which Cuſtom deduces its Origin from the Goſpel: But when and whence the Grant of the *Pall* in the Church had its Inſtitution, does no where appear. They would ſeem to deſcribe the *Pall* from *Iſidore Pelenſiora*, *L.* 1. *Ep.* 136. to *Hermin*; where he ſays, *The little Cloak or Mantle which the Prieſt wore on his Shoulders was made of Wool, not of Linen; ſignifying thereby the Fleece of that Sheep which its Maſter found wandering, and laid on his Shoulders; and emblematically implying, that a Biſhop, who bears the Type of Chriſt, ſhould diſcharge his Office, and, being cloathed with that Habit, ſhew to all, that he imitates that good and great*

Shepherd

Shepherd who bore the Infirmities of his Flock. It likewiſe appears from the ſame *Iſidore*, that not only the Metropolitans in *Greece*, but the Biſhops, uſed this Sort of Cloak or Mantle: But what's this to the Conceſſion of the *Pall*? The Authors of the fabulous Donation of *Conſtantine* ſay, *That the Emperor* Conſtantine *gave to Pope* Silveſter *his Superhumerale or Hood which he wore upon his Shoulders; which ſeems to be a Reſemblance or Species of the Pall.* But every like is not the ſame. However, ſuppoſing this Donation to be true, (though it is an apparent direct Forgery) it makes againſt the original Grant of it in the Pope; for the true Inference from this Citation is, that the Conceſſion of the *Pall* was from the Emperor to the Pope. *Baronius* in his Annals, *Tome* V. *ad An.* 432. towards the End, mentions a Privilege of the Church of *Ravenna*, which by the Emperor *Valentinian* was erected into a Metropolis, and that he granted the Uſe of the *Pall* to *John* Biſhop thereof: Which Privilege *Baronius* moſt furiouſly oppoſes; affirming, That the Grant of the *Pall* belongs to the Pope, and not to the Emperor. This is aſſerting, but not proving; and taking that for granted which is ſtill in Diſpute. I do not deny, ſays *Richerius*, that the Biſhops of *Rome*, from the Time of *Gregory the Great*, have practiſed the Grant of the *Pall* to Metropolitans; but the Controverſy in Hand is about the Firſt Inſtitution of it, and whether the Conceſſion of it was from the Emperors, or from the Church? He muſt be very ignorant of Hiſtory, who will deny, that the Emperors have erected Metropolis's; and therefore *Baronius* is very much in the wrong to oppoſe this Privilege of the *Pall* granted by *Valentinian* to the Church of *Ravenna*. *Liberatus*, in his Hiſtory, which he calls his *Breviary*, *cap.* 21. relates, *That when* Anthimus *found he muſt quit the*

See of Conſtantinople, *he return'd the Pall to the Emperors.* From whence it is plain, that the Emperors beſtowed the *Pall* on the Patriarchs. And for this Reaſon, I ſuppoſe, *Gregory, L.* 1. *Ep.* 27. ſays, *That he importuned the Emperor* Maurice, *to permit the Uſe of the Pall to* Anaſtaſius *Patriarch of* Antioch, *that he might celebrate Maſs in the Church of St.* Peter, *Prince of the Apoſtles.* To what Purpoſe ſhould Pope *Gregory* petition the Emperor to grant the Uſe of the *Pall* to *Anaſtaſius*, if the Emperor had not the Right of diſpoſing of it? And as for granting Leave to *Anaſtaſius* to celebrate Maſs in St. *Peter's* Church, it was undoubtedly in Pope *Gregory's* own Power; but the Uſe of the *Pall* could be granted only by the Emperor. From hence it is beyond Controverſy, That the Inſtitution of the *Pall* was firſt in the Emperors; the Diſpoſing of which, as the Empire declin'd, the Biſhops of *Rome* aſſumed, as they did many other Things. Upon which ſeveral Innovations and Encroachments crept in immediately, and the old Canonical Inſtitutions were inverted. The ancient Cuſtom of Patriarchs was ſoon after their Conſecration to ſend Synodical Letters of their Ordination and Profeſſion of their Faith to other Patriarchs; but the *Roman* Pontiffs, by ſending the *Pall* to Metropolitans, imperiouſly demand of them an Account of their Faith. This crept in ſo early as with Pope *Pelagius* I. who pleads the Uſe of the *Pall*; complaining, that Metropolitans refuſed to give any Account of their Faith to him, or accept the *Pall* from him: Upon which he decrees, *That whoſoever ſhall not within the Space of Six Months do both, ſhall be deprived.* *Gregory* the *Great*, though a Supplicant to the Emperor *Maurice* for the Uſe of the *Pall* for the Patriarch of *Antioch*, takes upon him to diſpoſe of a *Pall* to a Biſhop of *Corinth*, who was no Subject to the Patriarch of *Rome*;

Rome; which could be no more at that Time than paying a Compliment to a Biſhop in Poſſeſſion before, without the Authority or Power of the See of *Rome*: But theſe early Encroachments furniſh them with Precedents; and from them they plead, That ſo long ſince ſuch and ſuch a Biſhop received his *Pall* from the *Roman* Patriarch. But in the Time of *Gregory* VII. the ancient Uſe of the *Pall* is changed from what it was in Pope *Paſchal* and *Gregory* the *Great*'s Time: Then it was to give an Account of their Faith, but now it is employed as an Inſtrument to exact an Oath of Fidelity and Obedience from the Metropolitans to the Biſhop of *Rome*: The Neglect of which made *Gregory* VII. *L.* 1. *Ep.* 9. very angry with the Archbiſhop of *Roan*; commanding him not to ordain any Biſhop or Prieſt, or conſecrate any Church, till he had taken his *Pall* from *Rome*, according to the Cuſtom of the Apoſtolick See. The ſame likewiſe Pope *Paſchal* II. claims: So that we may juſtly infer from hence, what was originally given as a Mark of Honour and Dignity, is by long Practice grown a heavy Burden; the Court of *Rome* forbidding Metropolitans the Execution of their Office, which they are by Divine Right obliged to perform, till they had taken up their *Pall*; which at beſt is but meerly a Ceremonial, contributing nothing to the Epiſcopal Function. But in ſucceeding Ages, by this Ceremony of the *Pall*, the Biſhops of *Rome* not only ſubdued the *Weſtern*, but the *Eaſtern* Churches to the Monarchy of the *Roman* Pontiff, as appears plainly in the Fifth Canon of the Fourth *Lateran* Council; which makes it the Plenitude of the Pontifical Office.

In Order to the utter Extirpation of the *Albigenſes* and *Vaudois*, there were Two Things inſtituted, or at leaſt confirmed, in this Council; and

which

which ſeem to take their Riſe from Two Canons of it, *viz.* the Office of Inquiſition from the Eighth, and the Order of Preachers from the Ninth; tho' the Project is chiefly owing to *Dominic* of *Spain*, a Regular of the Church of *Oſme*, who was preſent at this Council, and treated with great Reſpect by Pope *Innocent* III. This *Dominic* having form'd the Deſign of the Order of Preachers, gets it confirmed in this Council: The Intent of which was to train up a certain Number of Men, who by their powerful Oratory ſhould be able to convince the *Albigenſes*, and convert them, and all other Hereticks. But ſuſpecting their own Abilities, an armed Force was ſent to ſubdue them, under the Name of *Croyſades*; and to crown this pious Work, they ſet up the Office of the *Holy Inquiſition*, that Scandal and Scourge of the Chriſtian Religion, that Rack of Conſciences, and Shop of Cruelty and Butchery. *Ludovicus a Paramo*, who was an Inquiſitor, in his Book *de Orig. Officii S. Inquiſit. l.* 1. *tit.* 2. *c.* 1. moſt ridiculouſly lays the Foundation of it in Paradiſe, making God the Firſt Inquiſitor, and our Firſt Parents by their Fall guilty of Hereſy: And leaſt this pretty Story ſhould want Embelliſhment, he tells us, That after the Great Inquiſitor had condemn'd them in a formal Manner, he enjoin'd them a Pennance, which they perform'd, wearing Leathern Garments; in Imitation of which, the *Benedictines* afterwards wore the *Sanbenito*. He might much more properly have made *Adam* the Author of Open-knee'd Breeches. This wretched Fabuloſity is downright playing with holy Things, and making a prophane Jeſt of Religion. The *Inquiſition* having been treated of by ſeveral Hands, I ſhall only add here, that it was firſt ſet up at *Toulouſe*, and in other Cities of *Languedoc*, where the *Albigenſes* and *Vaudois* had gotten the deepeſt Footing.

ing. The Popes ſet it up in *Italy*, from whence a long Time after it paſs'd into *Spain*; but it was baniſh'd *France*, and could never be brought into *Germany*; though the Emperor *Frederic* II. did protect the Inquiſitors, allowing them to take Cognizance of the Crime of Hereſy; but he left the Power of puniſhing to the Laity.

The Forty ſeventh and Forty eighth Canons of this Council relate to Church-Diſcipline, particularly Excommunication, and the Conſequences of it: In the End of which there is a particular Exception in Favour of Regulars, who are exempted from Cenſures of this Nature, as having ſpecial Rules of Diſcipline among themſelves. By this the old Encroachment of the Monaſtick State upon the Epiſcopal is revived and confirmed, diſcharging Regulars from the Juriſdiction of their Dioceſans. The Fifty ſeventh Canon is another Inſtance of the Pope's Partiality and Favour to the Monks or Regulars, who, out of their own Order, own no Superior but the Pope: For which he favourably diſtinguiſhed them from the Secular Clergy, nay, from the Biſhops themſelves. They are in this Canon allowed, upon their annual Circuits when they go to receive their Rents, to celebrate Divine Service in the Church of the Place, though it be actually under Interdict; calling their Arrival in ſuch a Place *Jucundus Adventus*. But in the Fifty eighth Canon, a Biſhop that ſhall happen to come into any Place where the Church is under Interdict, his Arrival is ſo far from being called *Jucundus*, that though he is allowed to celebrate in the Church, yet it is with theſe Reſtrictions: *He ſhall cauſe the Church-Doors to be ſhut, ſpeak with a low Voice, allow no Bells to be rung; and if there be any ſpecial Prohibition enjoin'd, he ſhall not preſume to celebrate.* But there are none of theſe Cautions and Reſtrictions

ſtrictions on the Regulars: They cannot be thought to err, or incur an Interdict. I ſhall add but a few Words more of this Council, or the Pope that preſided in it, both which expired in a ſhort Time after each other. Notwithſtanding the many and conſiderable Advantages Pope *Innocent* III. gain'd in this Council to the Papal Dignity, and the great (though wicked) Points he maintained and carried, and though this Council is call'd General, yet there are ſtrong Preſumptions which detract very much from the Credit and Authority of it. 1. The Canons of this Council carry not the leaſt Shadow of Synodical Authority with them, but look more like the arbitrary Pragmatick Decrees of Pope *Innocent*, than any joint Conſent of a Synod; aſſuming to himſelf in the Style of them the Power of Indulging, Can. 57. Calling the Biſhop of *Rome* the *Plenitude of Power*, Can. 62. *&c.* All which carry an Air of Sovereignty in them, belonging to the Pope more than the Synod. 2. Conſidering the great and illuſtrious Appearance in this Council, which conſiſted of 412 Biſhops, among whom were Two Patriarchs, *viz.* of *Conſtantinople* and *Jeruſalem*, (though both of them *Latins*) 71 Primates and Metropolitans, and 800 Abbots and Priors, it might reaſonably have been expected, that the Decrees of this Synod ſhould have been confirmed by a general Subſcription; but there is not the Name of one ſubſcribed to them. This the Learned *Du Pin* makes appear very plain in his *Diſſert.* 7. § 4. *de Antiquit. Eccleſ. Diſciplin.* and likewiſe in *Vol.* XI. *p.* 103. upon this Council, he ſays: "Hiſtorians tell us of ſeveral Matters, which were "regulated by this Council, but rather by the "Pope." So that from hence we may infer, the Canons of this Council look more like the arbitra-

ry

ry Acts of Pope *Innocent* III. than the Decrees of the Biſhops here aſſembled.

[1216.] *Centius Sabellius*, Cardinal-Prieſt, ſucceeds *Innocent* III. by the Name of *Honorius* III. He was a ſtrenuous Promoter of Expeditions to the Holy-Land, and againſt the *Albigenſes*, *Vaudois*, *&c.* In the Firſt of which he ſucceeded, by the Help of a pretended Viſion of St. *Peter*, who by Revelation foretold the ſpeedy Reducing of *Jeruſalem*. *Con. T.* 11. *par.* 1. *p.* 242. In the other he diſputes with various Succeſs for ſeveral Years, till *Raimond* Count of *Tolouſe*, and others, who had headed the *Albigenſes*, were forced to ſubmit, which was about the Year 1225. when, in the Council of *Bourges*, *Raimond* had his Lands reſtor'd; having the Year before, in the Council of *Mompellier*, taken an Oath to live peaceably, to pay Obedience to the Church of *Rome*, to reſtore the Clergy their Rights, and within the Space of Three Months to pay Fifteen thouſand Marks for Damages done; and, to the utmoſt of his Power, to extirpate Hereſy throughout his whole Province. This Pope, well knowing from the Practice of his Predeceſſors of what vaſt Advantage the Preſervation of the Holy-Land was to the See of *Rome*, reſolves to forward the Expedition thither with all his Intereſt; and therefore commands the Emperor *Frederick*, under Pain of Excommunication, to march an Army thither, notwithſtanding the Neceſſity of his own Affairs to the contrary; which he delaying to do, his Holineſs is as good as his Word, (or his Predeceſſors ſeldom failing in this Caſe) and forthwith excommunicates him. But this Matter the Editors, *Con. T.* 11. *par.* 2. *p.* 301. in their Account of the Council of *Cremona*, ſeem to ſet in a true Light. Out of the *Turen* Chronicle they tell us, That *A. D.* 1226. the Emperor *Frederick* held a Council

Council at *Cremona* about the Extirpation of the Hereticks out of *Italy*, and about the Affairs of the Holy-Land: But the Cities of *Italy*, confederating upon his Approach, refuſed to obey or receive him; ſo that he was forced to retire to *Appulia, re infectâ*. Here was the true Cauſe of his Holineſs's Diſpleaſure; not ſo much the Affair of the Holy-Land, which he would by no Means have neglected: But the Emperor's holding a Council about theſe Affairs without his Conſent, and in *Italy* too, ſwells the Stomach of the Supreme Pontiff. The Sovereign Biſhop never car'd to have an Emperor in *Rome*, or any Part of *Italy*, unleſs it were to ſet their Feet upon the Shoulders of him. The Emperor's Approach gives the Alarm to the Holy See, which, like a Beacon, warns the Eccleſiaſtick State of the Invader's Coming, and to arm againſt him: Though the Emperor was ever ſo much in earneſt in the Caſe of extirpating Hereticks, or going to the Holy-Land, yet his ſetting Foot in *Italy*, and holding a Council without the Pope's Conſent, was an Infringement the Court of *Rome* could not digeſt: It was treading upon the Toes of the Supremacy, in preſuming to do what formerly had been their Right, though now alter'd.

This Year, *viz.* 1226. is very remarkable for a bold Attempt of the Biſhop of *Rome* upon all Eccleſiaſtick Dignities. It begun in *England*; and had it ſucceeded there, would, no Doubt, have been received every where elſe; which would have mede the *Servus Servorum* the moſt wealthy Potentate upon Earth. But *Henry* III. King of *England*, wiſely foreſeeing the Conſequence, handſomely diverted it. *Matthew Paris* relates it thus: "*Stephen Langton*, Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, cal-
"ling a Council at *Weſtminſter*, caus'd the Pope's
"Letters concerning the Conferring of Benefices

" on the Biſhop of *Rome*, to be read before the " King and Prelates of *England*; which they no " ſooner underſtood, but all began to reflect on " the Covetouſneſs of the *Romans*. The King, " calling the Prelates and Nobility together, re- " turn'd this Anſwer to the Archbiſhop: What the " Pope demands of us relates to the Chriſtian " World in general: We therefore, who are ſitu- " ated at ſo great a Diſtance, when we ſhall ſee " how other Nations receive theſe Demands, ſhall " by their Example be the more ready to anſwer " them." But the foreſaid Author purſues this Story more at large, giving the Reaſon for the Pope's Demand. " Cardinal *Otho*, the Pope's Le- " gate, alledging the Scandal that the Church of " *Rome* laboured under by being ſo dilatory in her " Proceedings, that none could have their Buſineſs " diſpatched in the Court of *Rome* without a vaſt " Expence of Money and Preſents; and that the " Poverty of the Church of *Rome* was the Cauſe " of this Scandal, tells them they ought, as dutiful " Sons, to take off this Scandal; for unleſs they " received Preſents from ſuch good Men as they " were, they ſhould want the common Neceſſaries " of Life, which would be very unbecoming the " *Roman* Dignity. If therefore they would con- " ſent to this Demand, they would not only re- " move this Reproach from their Mother the " Church, but might alſo have Juſtice done them " in the Diſpatch of their Affairs without the uſual " Preſents." The Form of the Demand runs thus: *We demand of all Cathedral Churches Two Prebends to be conferr'd on us, one from the Portion of the Biſhop, and another of the Chapter: Likewiſe of Religious Houſes, where there are diſtinct Portions of the Abbots and the Convents, we demand the Portion of one Monk, and as much of the Abbot.* This would have been a deli-

cious

cious Morſel out of the Revenues of the Church of *England*; but in other Countries it would have amounted to an immenſe Sum. But notwithſtanding the preſſing Inſtances of the Cardinal-Legate, the Deſign was baffled by many Delays and Diſappointments, which were on Purpoſe thrown in the Way to oppoſe this exorbitant and unreaſonable Demand. At which Cardinal *Baronius*, *Spondanus*, and others, are not a little angry, hinting, that there were not wanting ſuch malign Diſpoſitions, as always oppos'd ſo great a Good.

The Firſt Epiſtle of this Pope is to *Henry* III. King of *England*; and though we cannot for Want of Date tell when it was written, yet by the Manner of it we may reaſonably ſuppoſe it deſigned to prepare that Prince to encourage the forementioned Demand. He embraces him with a ſpecial Affection, as his moſt beloved Son, applauds his early pious Inclinations to the Fear of God, and virtuous Diſpoſition, and obliges him to an humble Veneration of the Church and her Miniſters.

The Second Epiſtle is to the Biſhops of *England*, in the Caſe of *Richard* Biſhop of *Durham*, a Man of moſt ſcandalous Life: In which, having enumerated many heavy Crimes charged on him, ſuch as Murder, Simony, Adultery, Sacrilege, Perjury, *&c.* he likewiſe accuſes him of not paying Deference to Appeals to the See of *Rome*. Had the Biſhop of *Durham* been innocent of all the other Crimes alledged againſt him, this alone had been enough to have condemned him. But after he has reckon'd up the ſeveral Parts of the Accuſation, in a moſt profane and arrogant Manner, he aſſumes the Style of the Moſt High almoſt to a Letter. *Cum adeo ad nos Clamor ſuper his aſcenderit, dignum duximus ex Officii noſtri Debito deſcendere, ut hæc an ita ſint vel aliter, videamus.* Con. T. 11. par. 1. p. 243.

Becauſe

Becauſe the Cry of theſe Things is come up to us, we have thought fit, according to the Duty of our Office, to go down, that we may know whether theſe Things are ſo or not. How prophane this Expreſſion in a Mortal is, though a Sovereign Pontiff, let the Impartial judge, by comparing it with this Text, *Gen.* 18. *v.* 20, 21. *Becauſe the Cry of* Sodom *and* Gomorrah *is great, and becauſe their Sin is exceeding grievous, I will go down now and ſee, whether they have done altogether according to the Cry which is come unto me, and if not, that I may know.* To imitate God in all Things is impoſſible, and in many Things unlawful, as when our Imitation preſumes to make us equalize our ſelves with God. The grand Prelate in this Expreſſion makes a wrong Uſe of the Keys, in preſuming to aſſimilate his Power to that of the Great God; amongſt whoſe Perfections there is not one propoſed for our Imitation, but his Goodneſs: He never commanded us to follow his Example, but in this one Virtue: *Be ye holy, as I am holy.* Levit. 11. 44, 45. *Be ye merciful, as your Father alſo is merciful.* Luk. 6. 36. Had this proud Eccleſiaſtick Monarch conſulted St. *Auſtin* on thoſe Words of our Bleſſed Saviour, *Learn of me, &c.* they might have check'd his Preſumption. *Non dicit, diſcite a me Mundum fabricare, non cuncta viſibilia & inviſibilia creare, non in ipſo Mundo mirabilia facere, ſed quoniam mitis ſum & humilis Corde. He doth not ſay, learn of me to build the curious and ſtately Fabrick of the World, to create all Things viſible and inviſible therein contained; no, but learn of me, for I am meek and lowly of Heart.* Sovereignity and Power are not the Inheritance of our Lord to his Spouſe the Church, and his Children the Clergy. To trample upon the Backs of Kings, and deliver them over to Satan upon every ſecular Caprice, comes ſhort of the Indulgence of a Spiritual Father: And to ſacrifice that Flock to ſordid Avarice and

Ambition, which Chriſt ranſom'd with his Blood, is very unbecoming the Character of a true Paſtor. But theſe have too often been the Marks of Scandal in the Biſhops of *Rome*, as already has been obſerved, and will more infamouſly appear in many following Inſtances; and in none more than in the ſucceeding Pope.

[1227.] *Gregory* IX. before call'd *Hugoline*. He was Nephew to *Innocent* III. by whom he was created Cardinal, and whoſe Steps for the promoting the Intereſt of the Pontificate he moſt exactly trod in. The Empire and the Pontificate had for many Ages caſt a jealous Eye on each other; each concluding, that nothing could ſo much contribute to the Eſtabliſhing of the others Greatneſs, as its Rival's Deſtruction; which made them ſtrike ſo heartily at one another, their vigorous and frequent Attacks continually involving the Empire, both in *Germany* and *Italy*, in Blood. But what contributed chiefly to the Advancement of the Pontificate, and Depreſſion of the Empire, were theſe Two Things: 1. The Collection and Publication of the Decretals (in which this Pope was perſonally active, being generally ſuppos'd to be the Compiler of the Decretal) gave the laſt Blow towards the Ruine of the ancient Laws, and eſtabliſhing the abſolute and unlimited Power of Proceſſes, which were afterwards brought before the Court of *Rome*. 2. The Differences of the Princes of *Germany*, in the Election of the Emperor, gave the Popes an Opportunity of maintaining this Right over the Empire, and of ſtrengthening their Temporal Power in *Italy*.

The Editors in this Pope's Life are very tender, not relating the moſt minute Circumſtance that may ſully his Character; though his Actions were as black as any of his Predeceſſors, but continue

to

to inveigh ſeverely againſt the Emperor *Frederic*, and other Enemies of the Papacy. In the Beginning of his Pontificate, Pope *Gregory* IX. commands the Emperor, upon Pain of Excommunication, to lead an Army into *Aſia*; in which being retarded by Sickneſs, the impatient Pontiff forthwith anathematizes him. The Emperor no ſooner recovers, but, without his Holineſs's Abſolution, he prepares for the Holy-Land. Whether the Pope was affronted at the Emperor's Undertaking this Expedition without his Abſolution, or whether he was glad of the Opportunity his Abſence offer'd, I will not ſay: But it is certain the pious Pope takes hold of the Occaſion, and invades the Emperor's Territories in *Lombardy*, and other Parts of *Italy*; which he claims and ſeizes, as the Patrimony of the Church. It was a foul Action indeed, to invade the Dominions of an abſent Prince, at that Time hazarding his own and the Lives of his People in Defence of the Church of Chriſt, againſt a powerful Army of Infidels: But the ſubſequent Actions of this Pope ſhew him the greateſt Infidel of his Time; for, whether through Envy at the Emperor's Succeſs in the Eaſt, or Apprehenſion of his growing Greatneſs, which might afterwards eclipſe the Papal Grandeur, (no Matter which, for neither can excuſe the Baſeneſs of the Action) he moſt treacherouſly conſpires with the Knights-Templers to deſtroy the Emperor: To compleat which impious Deſign, he writes to the *Soldan* of the *Saracens*, inſtructing him how he might ſurprize *Frederic* upon the Banks of *Jordan*. The generous *Soldan* abhorring ſuch Perfidy, not only acquaints the Emperor with the Conſpiracy, but ſends him the Pope's very Letters, which were an undeniable Teſtimony of his Holineſs's Treachery. The Editors give not the leaſt Hint of this Part of

the Story, but fall to railing moſt furiouſly againſt the Emperor, for having, after his great Succeſs in *Aſia*, and taking *Jeruſalem*, made a Peace with the *Soldan* without the Conſent and Knowledge of the Princes *Con. T. par.* 1. *p.* 310. He did make a Peace with the *Soldan*, and indeed it was high Time; for how could that Prince be ſaid to be ſafe, when the Biſhop of *Rome*, who ought to have protected his Dominions in his Abſence, baſely diſpoſſed him of them, and at a Diſtance engaged in a villainous Conſpiracy againſt his Life? Which he had inevitably loſt, but for the Generoſity of an honeſt Heathen, whoſe Morals by this Action far outſhined the Profeſſion of Chriſtianity in this Infidel-Pope; and for the Ten Years Peace, as the Editors call it, it was not only prudent, but generous and grateful in him. For in the firſt Place, it was Time for him to return to recover his Dominions, which the Pope had raviſhed from him in his Abſence: Next, he could not propoſe any Security to his Perſon among ſuch Devotees of the *Roman* Prelate's Ambition, as the Templers, who, though they had taken upon them the Croſs, yet fought and conſpired againſt the Intereſt of it. And laſtly, the generous Act of the *Soldan*, in diſcovering the treacherous Conſpiracy againſt his Life, demanded this grateful Return, though it had been upon hard Terms, which this was not. But though the Editors ſay nothing of theſe vile Actions in this Pope's Life, yet in the Two Epiſtles of Pope *Gregory viz.* XI. and XII. *Con. T.* 11. *par.* 1. *p.* 337, & 340. *&c.* he charges the Emperor with the blackeſt Calumny that can be invented; eſpecially in the latter, where, to the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* and his Suffragans, he makes a diſmal Complaint of the unjuſt Charge of the Emperor, but does not clear himſelf of any Part of

of it, any more than by downright denying ſome of it. After ſeveral hard Names, he tells them, how the Emperor had belied him, in ſaying he had relinquiſh'd him becauſe he went to the Holy-Land without having ſued for Abſolution; and that by holding a Correſpondence with the *Soldan* of the *Saracens*, he had prevented his Succeſs in Recovery of the Holy-Land. Now, as heavy as this Charge is, the Pope does not alleviate it by any tolerable Anſwer; for he ſays, *ibid. p.* 341. "That he, (*viz.* "the Emperor) deſpiſing the Authority of the "Keys, enters *Syria* without having firſt received "Abſolution; where between him and the *Soldan* "a Truce was agreed upon for Six Years." All this is true, and yet no Scandal on the Emperor, nor Excuſe for the Pope's correſponding with an Infidel Prince againſt a Chriſtian. Such weak Defences do but confirm an Accuſation; and his Holineſs had as good have ſaid nothing, ſince he ſpeaks ſo little to the Purpoſe. But the great Deſign of theſe two Epiſtles aforeſaid is to wheedle the King of *England* into the Pope's Intereſt againſt the Emperor.

The Epiſtle of *Germanus*, who ſtyles himſelf Archbiſhop, not Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, is the moſt fulſome and prophane Piece of Flattery that ever was penn'd by a *Roman* Paraſite, and ſo very unlike a Patriarch of the *Greek* Church, by the Conceſſions of unlimited Supremacy to that of the *Romiſh*, that it cannot gain Credit enough with the ingenuous to be look'd upon as genuine, but rather foiſted in as a Confirmation of the Acknowledgment of the Supremacy from a Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*. This appears plainer yet from the two Epiſtles of Pope *Gregory* IX. in Anſwer to this of *Germanus*, which is written in the very ſame Style and Air, and in the ſame Phraſe, confirming the

Conceſſions and Acknowledgments of *Germanus*; only *Gregory* in the Second (which is the Sixth in Number, *ib. p.* 325.) enlarges the Power of the Keys ſomewhat beyond what *Germanus* does in his; who only calling the Sword of Anathematization a Two-edg'd Sword, *ib. p.* 219, Pope *Gregory* fearing that Expreſſion of *Germanus* ſhould not ſufficiently be underſtood, takes upon him to add to and explain it from a Text of Scripture. "There are "two Swords, ſays he, which the Lord thought "fit, for the reſtraining of Spiritual and Corporal "Offences. If you grant the material (or *Corporal*) Sword to belong to the Temporal Power, "mark what our Lord ſays to *Peter* in *Mat.* 26. 52. "*Put up thy Sword into his Place.* Where by the "Word, *thy*, he meant the material Sword. And "as to the Spiritual Sword, no Body queſtions "that by Special Commiſſion he gave the Power "of Binding and Looſing to St. *Peter*. Therefore "both Swords are deliver'd to the Church, one "to be exercis'd by the Prieſt, the other by the "Soldier according to the Direction of the Prieſt" What a ridiculous Inference is here, and how unfair is it to deduce an Original of Power from a curt and imperfect Text? Without Doubt the Sword with which St. *Peter* ſmote the High-Prieſt's Servant was his own, and therefore no Emphaſis belongs to the Pronoun *Thy* more than to any other Word in the ſame Sentence. But the Context (which his Infallibilily over-look'd or was ignorant of) puts the whole beyond Diſpute. *Put up thy Sword into his Place, for they which take the Sword ſhall periſh by the Sword.* Now, if they will derive their Power of the Temporal Sword from this Text, they take it with a Curſe; and indeed it has literally proved ſo wherever they have uſed it. But from both Text and Context it is plain, our Sa-

Saviour forbad the Uſe of the Civil Sword to his Diſciples, and conſequently to their Followers and Succeſſors; and the more to reſtrain them from it, he threatens them with the Puniſhment of *Periſhing by it.* As to the *Power of Binding and Looſing*, which, he ſays, by ſpecial Commiſſion is appropriated to *Peter*, the Infallible Judge is as much out as in the other. I readily grant that our Bleſſed Lord, *Mat.* 16. 19. gave the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven to *Peter*, and likewiſe the Power of binding and looſing: But doth this imply that he gave it to him only? Certainly not. And it's plain that he gave the ſame Power to the reſt of his Diſciples, from that of St. *John* 20. 22, 23. ----- *Receive ye the Holy Ghoſt. Whoſoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whoſoever Sins ye retain, they are retained.* Our Lord did not ſay, Receive thou the Holy Ghoſt, *&c.* in the ſingular Number; but receive *Ye* the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe Sins *Ye* remit, and whoſe Sins *Ye* retain. Which Diſpenſation was equally beſtow'd on them all, without Reſerve or Reſtraint.

But before we part with *Germanus*'s Epiſtle to this Pope, there is a prophane Paſſage in it, which renders it very ſuſpicious; and, by its Similitude to that of Pope *Honorius* III. to the Biſhops of *England*, carries a Note of Forgery by ſome Creature of the Pontificate in it. After an Invocation of, and Supplication to the Bleſſed Jeſus, he addreſſes himſelf to the Pope in theſe Words. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 1. *p.* 318. "Having firſt lifted up our "Eyes to the Heavenly Mount, from whence we "have pray'd for Help, we next apply our ſelves "to Thee moſt Holy Father, who poſſeſſeſt the "Primacy of the Apoſtolick See, that thou "wouldſt deſcend from the Height of Glory "to hearken to the Words of me a wretched

"Creature." This Expreſſion is ſo very like the foreſaid Pontifical Arrogance, that it ſeems but a Copy or Tranſcript from it; and cannot by any reaſonable Man be allow'd to be the genuine Senſe of a Patriarch of the *Greek* Church, which never yet made ſuch mean Conceſſions and Applications to the Patriarch of *Rome* upon any Occaſion whatſoever, but rather inſiſted on her own Rights and Prerogative in Oppoſition to *Rome*.

I ſhall make but one Remark on theſe Epiſtles before I leave them, except what ſhall caſually fall in the Way during the Pontificate of this Pope. Pope *Gregory* in his Fifth Epiſtle to *Germanus*, *ib.* p. 322. very inauſpiciouſly ſtumbles upon an ancient Miſtake of Pope *Anacletus*, who derives the Word *Cephas* (which is the *Syriac* Name of *Peter*, ſignifying a Stone) from the *Greek* Word κέφαλη; which Pope *Gregory* IX. in this Epiſtle confirms by this Alluſion. *As the Perfection or Plenitude of the Senſes is contained in the Head, from which every Part, as a Stream from its Fountain, is by Secret Ducts deriv'd:* Proving St. *Peter*'s Supremacy by this ſilly Miſtake.

The reſt of this Epiſtle attempts to prove St. *Peter*'s Supremacy in Oppoſition to that of St. *Paul*, from the above-mentioned Texts out of St. *Matthew* and St. *John*, which have already been ſufficiently refuted.

A. D. 1229, Cardinal *Romanus*, Pope *Gregory*'s Legate, preſided in the Council of *Toloufe*, the firſt Twelve Canons of which relate particularly to the Inquiſition and its Power. The Fourteenth ſtrictly forbids the Laity the Uſe of any Books of the Holy Scriptures, except the Pſalms, and their own Breviary; which, that they might the leſs underſtand, they are forbidden in the vulgar Tongue. But this was with Deſign, as they pretend, to prevent the Growth of Hereſy; tho' in Truth it was

to

to oblige the Laity to an implicit Dependance on their whimsical Expositions, and disingenuous Interpretations of Holy Writ, and chiefly to suppress the *Albingenses* and *Vaudois*, whose Leader *Peter Waldius*, in the 12th Century, had begun to expound the *New Testament* to the People in the vulgar Tongue, and from thence instructed them in sound Principles of Faith, and true Moral Doctrine. But the World, according to this Canon, must remain still in Darkness, and receive no Benefit of that Gospel-Light which the Son of God intended for the Relief of all Mankind. There have been and are still too many, who uncall'd officiously take upon them to interpret the Holy Scripture, and very often through Ignorance or Mal-Intention pervert the Sense to their vile Purposes; but to deprive the Laity utterly of the Use of them, is as wild an Extream as the other, and of as dangerous Consequence.

The Inquisition having by Degrees in several Councils gain'd Strength, but chiefly from the Diploma of the supream Pontiff to all of them, did not appear in its full Force and Vigour till the Third Council of *Narbonne*, which was held *A. D.* 1235. The Second Council of *Tolouse*, *A. D.* 1229, in the first Canon appoints the Number of the Inquisitors, *viz.* One Priest, and Two, Three, or more Laymen, as Occasion shall offer. The Second Council of *Arles*, *A. D.* 1234. Can. 5. says the same; and other Councils are very indulgent to the Growth of this Shop of Cruelty. But the Third Council of *Narbonne* gives it the finishing Stroke; tho' it might more properly be said to be done by Pope *Gregory* IX.'s Mandate. For tho' the Editors, in the Inscription before the Canons of this Council, would have us believe, that this was

wholly their Act, without any Inducement or Inſtigation of another, directing thus: "*Peter* by the "Grace of God of *Narbonne*, *John* of *Arles*, *Raimund* "of *Aix*, Archbiſhops, and their Suffragans, to the "beloved and faithful Sons in Chriſt, the Brothers-"Inquiſitors of the Order of Preachers, greeting. *Con. T. Par.* 1. *p.* 488. Yet it is plain from *Spondanus*'s Continuation of *Baronius*, *T.* 1. *ad An.* 1233. that it was the immediate Mandate of Pope *Gregory* IX. who firſt inſtituted the Brothers-Preachers Inquiſitors. That Author is plain: *Mandato accepto a Sede Apoſtolica de Concilio impertiendo Fratribus Prædicatoribus, recens in illis Partibus conſtitutis Inquiſitoribus contra Hæreticos quomodo ſe gerere adverſus eos deberent* 29 *Capitula condiderunt de Pœnis, &c.* From whence it appears, that the Fathers of this Council had received Orders and Inſtructions from the See of *Rome* what to do, and how to behave themſelves againſt the Hereticks, which they were to impart to the Brothers-Preachers, who were by this Mandate conſtituted Inquiſitors. The 29 Chapters or Canons of this Council are but ſo many Dictates from the Pope, ſeveral of which intimate as much; more particularly the Second, which forbids Hereticks being allow'd by the Inquiſitors to tranſport themſelves any where beyond Sea, *according to the Pope's Prohibition.* And the Seventh, which allows the Inquiſitors to add to, or diminiſh the Pennances of Hereticks, as they ſhall think fit, *according to the Power committed to them by the Church of* ROME. And many others to the ſame Purpoſe. So that this Order of Preachers, who are by theſe Canons of this Council confirm'd Inquiſitors in theſe Parts, received their primary Inſtitution from the Pope, and which is only tranſmitted to them here by the Fathers of this Coun-

cil;

cil; but undoubtedly with this Deſign, to make theſe Prelates thus conſenting the Inſtruments of conveying this Power to the Inquiſitors over themſelves, when any of them ſhall act in Oppoſition to the Intereſt of the Apoſtolick See. Fatal Experience has too often explain'd this to be a Project of the Court of *Rome* to eſtabliſh their uſurp'd Supremacy; for in thoſe Countries where the Inquiſition has been eſtabliſh'd, the ancient Orthodox Methods of Canonical Proceſſes have been laid aſide, and the lawful Power of Councils hath been forced to ſubmit to the arbitrary Determination of a few Regulars, who, according to the Practice of the pureſt and moſt primitive Times, were Subordinates in a very low Degree to Metropolitan and Dioceſan Biſhops. Thus the Ariſtocracy of the Church was diſſolv'd; and *Rome*, which was but a Part of the whole, and for many Ages but mean, became Head, by theſe and other Encroachments and Uſurpations. And although the 13th Canon of this Council reſerves a Power to the Biſhop of *Rome* of abſolving and impoſing Pennances on thoſe obſtinate Offenders who ſhall favour Hereticks, or neglect to perform Pennances injoin'd; yet the Inquiſitors of later Times have extended their Power ſo far, as to threaten the very Monarch of the Church with it, in the Perſon of Pope *Innocent* XI. for favouring *Molinos the Quietiſt*. The latter Part of the 29th Canon is a Confirmation of what has been ſaid of the Pope's dictating theſe Canons to this Council; for they acknowledge, "They of-
"fer not their Advice in theſe Matters, which
"would be a high Affront to the Apoſtolick See,
"from whence they (the Inquiſitors) had receiv'd
"their Power; but zealouſly offer their Help, as
"they were commanded by the ſame Apoſtolick
"See;

" See; *ſicut & nobis ab ipſa Apoſtolica Sede mandatum*
" *eſt, &c. Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 1. *p.* 501.

All the Canons of this Council relate wholly to the Inquiſition; and are indeed but ſo many Lectures upon the ſeveral Parts of Cruelty they treat of. I ſhall inſtance but in a few. " The 22d " forbids the Names of the Witneſſes to be publiſh'd " by any Sign or Word, according to the Order " of the Pope; and that, if the Perſon accuſed " ſhall urge that he has Enemies, the Inquiſitors " ſhall demand their Names, and the Cauſe of " their Differences, that the Truth may be known. *Con. T* 11. *Par.* 1. *p.* 494. This is reckon'd a very unjudicial Proceeding in Lay-Caſes; but is much more unjuſtifiable in Religious, wherein Religious Judges ought to exert their Charity in the moſt tender Sentiments of Perſons and Things. There never yet was a Man ſo perfect as to live without Enemies, and it has too frequently appeared, that the moſt Virtuous were the moſt violently attack'd, and therefore the moſt ſtrict Regard ought to be had to the Preſervation of their Innocence, which many Times ſuffers, whilſt Guilt triumphs in Impunity. There is an innate Quality in Innocence, which has often charm'd the moſt malicious Accuſer, and baffled a falſe Evidence, tho' of the moſt harden'd Front; but when an innocent Perſon is thus attack'd in the Dark, it is ſcarcely poſſible for him to make his Defence; and what is practic'd in no Court of Judicature in the Chriſtian World but in this of the Inquiſition.

The 24th and 25th Canons add ſtill to the Darkneſs of theſe Proceedings; for they allow, *ibid.* " all Perſons, tho' Criminals, ſcandalous, and even " Partakers of the Crime it ſelf, to be admitted as " Accuſers and Witneſſes, provided that their Teſtimony

" ſtimony or Accuſation does not proceed more " from Malice than any true Zeal to Juſtice: For, " ſay they, there are many Crimes which weaken " an Evidence, but not take it off, eſpecially if " the Witneſſes have ſatisfied the Law." Theſe two Canons are grounded upon a very falſe Baſis, for how frequently has the Malice of Men tranſported them beyond Truth and Juſtice, to teſtify againſt their Neighbours, not only in common Caſes, but thoſe of Life, and this in the Eye of the World has falſly been interpreted Zeal to Juſtice. But then, as to Perſons concern'd in the ſame Crime with the Accuſed, I cannot ſee how theſe Canons or any elſe can make it out that they ought to be admitted as legal Witneſſes: For Firſt, though they have made canonical Satisfaction for paſt Crimes, and are thereby become *Recti in Curia*, yet there ought to be a particular Regard had to the Weight of their Evidence. But Secondly, if they are involv'd in the Guilt of the ſame Crime with the Accuſed, they cannot be ſaid to have made canonical Satisfaction, and conſequently are not legal Witneſſes. Theſe Conſiderations would weigh mightily in other Courts of Judicature. But there are other Hardſhips: The 26th Canon ſays, " If any Man ſhall obſtinately deny the Crime by " which he is judg'd a Heretick, or Favourer of " ſuch, either by Witneſs, or other Proof, (*which " can be no other than Circumſtance*) he ſhall notwith- " ſtanding be eſteem'd a Heretick." This Canon is plainly founded upon the two former, but with this Improvement, *viz.* that of circumſtantial Proof, if there be no other Evidence; which makes the Caſe of the Accuſed ſtill more unreaſonable: For ſuppoſing a Set of hard-mouth'd Evidence, either through Malice, Fear, Hope of Gain, or ſaving their own Lives, ſwear Home againſt an innocent Per-

Perſon; or, if ſuch poſitive Evidence be wanting, bare circumſtantial Proof be alledg'd againſt the Perſon accuſed, he ſhall be condemned as a Heretick, or Favourer of ſuch. This is as ſevere as it is unreaſonable, for tho' this Canon pretends to give a Reaſon for it, *viz.* "That he is manifeſtly impenitent that will not confeſs his Fault:" Yet that Perſon who, being innocent of the Crime he is accuſed of, that ſhall be ſo unjuſt as through Fear or otherwiſe to accuſe himſelf, cannot be ſaid to be innocent to himſelf, tho' he is of the Crime; and he is indeed guilty of his own Blood, but not of what he ſtands accuſed; which is no Juſtification of this Canon, or its Reaſon. Such are the unreaſonable Methods of this Court of Inquiſition; which, tho' they were deſign'd againſt others, have often enſnar'd the very Inquiſitors themſelves, who then, though too late, condemn'd ſuch unjuſt Proceedings.

Gregory IX. now draws near the End of his Pontificate and Life, but not of his Malice. In the Year 1239, he again excommunicates the Emperor *Frederick*; and by his Legate *Jacob*, Cardinal Biſhop of *Preneſte*, ſends a Letter to *Lewis* King of *France*; wherein, after a long Encomium on him and his Predeceſſors, he ſues for Aid againſt the Emperor, towards whom he is not ſparing of Invectives. But the Emperor making light of all this, the Cardinal Legate calls a Council at *Melde*, now *Meaulx*, in *France*; where, having before publiſh'd the Sentence of Excommunication againſt the Emperor, he commands ſome of them upon their Obedience to go with him perſonally to *Rome*: And the more effectually to ruine the Emperor's Intereſt, the Pope adviſes and perſuades his Son *Henry* to take Arms againſt him. But theſe wicked Methods had their deſerved Succeſs; for the good

Pope

Pope being defeated by the Emperor, is forc'd to accept of what hard Conditions of Peace the Conqueror would grant; which he was as dexterous at violating as any of his Predeceſſors. For the Emperor is no ſooner retir'd, but he renounces the Articles of Peace, excommunicates the Emperor once more, and abſolves his Subjects from their Allegiance to him. This was a Home Stroke indeed, and, no Doubt, heartily meant; but it wanted its deſired End: For Succeſs ſtill attending the Emperor, his Holineſs is defeated at his own Weapon. The Emperor, not to be behind-hand in ſo pious a Precedent, remonſtrates to the *Germans* the unmeaſurable Pride of the *Roman* Pontiff, which nothing leſs than Univerſality both in Church and State can gratify; which ſo prevail'd with the Biſhops of *Germany*, that they immediately threw off the *Roman* Yoak, and declaring, that the Biſhop of *Rome* had no Right in *Germany*, they abſolv'd the Emperor from his Excommunication; which ſo deeply affected good Pope *Gregory*, that he died of Grief; tho' the Editors, in their Account of him, ſay, that he died of Grief for the captive Biſhops that were taken Priſoners by the Emperor as they were going to *Rome*. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 1. *p.* 310.

[1241.] *Celeſtine* IV. ſucceeds Pope *Gregory* IX. a Man, according to *Mat. Paris*, of good Life and Learning: But being very old and infirm, he in few Days reſign'd the Pontificate with his Breath. Conſidering the entangled and confus'd State of Affairs both of the Empire and the Church at this Time, it is almoſt impoſſible but that this Pope muſt be ſchiſmatically elected. This the Editors very unluckily, as uſually, ſtart; but more lamely excuſe. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 1. *p.* 590. *Matt. Paris*, they ſay, writes, That Pope *Celeſtine* was choſen in Schiſm; for, according to the Firſt Canon of the Third

Third General *Lateran* Council, there ought to be Two Thirds of the Cardinals at the Election of a Pope; which at this Time could not be had, moſt of them being detained by the Emperor. But this they would ſeem to take off by the weak Help of *Abbas Stadenſis*, who, they ſay, tells us, That the two opponent Schiſmatical Competitors reſigning, *Celeſtine* was legally choſen in the Room of Pope *Gregory*. This is ſo far from excuſing, that it confirms this to be a Schiſmatical Election, by putting in One Schiſmatical Biſhop upon the Reſignation of Two. Beſides the Editors themſelves give for a Reaſon, in the Vacancy of the See of *Rome* upon *Celeſtine*'s Death, "That it was neither ſafe nor "convenient, in the Abſence of the captive Car-"dinals, to proceed to the Election of a Pontiff." Which may in Parity of Reaſon hold in the Caſe of *Celeſtine*, after Pope *Gregory* IX.'s Deceaſe, (for then the Cardinals were impriſon'd) as well as in the Caſe of *Innocent* IV. after *Celeſtine*'s; when the Holy See was vacant for Twenty Months. This is all the Editors can make of it; and their Friend *Cabbaſutius* paſſes it over in Silence; only in his Chronological Index inſerts *Celeſtine*, without any Mark of Schiſm, or Vacancy of the See, till *Innocent* IV.'s Election; which, notwithſtanding the poſitive Account the Editors give of it in the Life of this Pope, is as queſtionable as Pope *Celeſtine*'s.

[1243.] *Innocent* IV. before called *Sinibalad*, is by them ſaid to be choſen Pope the 24th of *June*, by the common Conſent of the Cardinals, whoſe Enlargement was obtained at the Requeſt of *Baldwin* Emperor of *Conſtantinople*, and *Lewis* King of *France*. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 1. *p.* 597. This might paſs for Truth with ſome that read no further, but the very ſame Authors, *ibid. p.* 634, 635. deſtroy the very Plauſibility of it, by a flat Contradiction in their Hiſto-

History of the First General Council of *Lyons*, which was the First Council called by *Innocent* IV. " *Cardinales vix post viginti Menses Innocentium quartum, Virum Doctrinâ & Virtute præstantem Pontificem maximum delegerunt. Hic Pontifex statim cum Friderico de Pace egit, Hominesque gravissimos ad illum misit, qui æquissimas ei Pacis Conditiones proponerent & postularent, ut Patres qui in Pugna navali capti fuerant, ut sæpe promiserat, Liberos redderet. His Pontificis Cohortationibus cùm Fridericus obtemperare nollet, &c.* The Cardinals, after near Twenty " Months Vacancy, chose *Innocent* IV. Pope; a " Man eminent for Learning and good Life: Who " immediately treats with the Emperor about " Peace, and setting at Liberty those Fathers " which were taken in the Sea-Fight, as he had " often promis'd. But *Frideric* would by no Means " hearken to any of these Proposals, *&c.*" But to explain this Relation a little more, and take off the most minute Objection; if any one should think that the Word *Patres* does not mean the Cardinals and Bishops, look but a few Lines back, *ibid.* and they are called by those very Names, *Episcopi & Cardinales capti sunt, &c.* " The *Genoese* Ships fal- " ling in with *Frideric*'s Fleet, the Bishops and " Cardinals were taken and carried to the Empe- " ror." From hence it must naturally be infer'd, That the Cardinals being detained by the Emperor, could not be at the Election of Pope *Innocent* any more than at *Celestine*'s; and consequently that Story of the Editors, which tells us that *Innocent* IV. was elected by the common Consent of the Cardinals, who were set at Liberty by *Frideric* at the Instance of the Emperor *Baldwin* and King *Lewis*, is a direct Falsity. Such Romantick Authors have need of better Memories! But they go on, and truly when their Hand's in, they know not

when or where to leave off. *Ibid. p.* 597. " This " Election, ſay they, was not in the leſt pleaſing " to *Frideric*, who knew *Innocent* to be a juſt and " generous Man; and therefore he was afraid that " he ſhould find him, who whilſt a Cardinal was " his Friend, to be his Enemy when Pope." This is very odd; for on the contrary *Frideric* had the greater Reaſon to expect a Friend in the Pope than an Enemy, they both, according to the Editors, having been good Friends before. And as to *Frideric*'s Diſlike of the Election, the Inference ſhews much Malice in the Author, without juſt Ground; for he muſt be the moſt abandon'd Wretch imaginable, that can be angry at any one for his Vertue: And as to the Election of this Pope being ungrateful to the Emperor, it had been better for the Editors to have been ſilent; for any Perſon will be apt to conclude, that that Prince who had the Electors in his Power, had he been ſuch a Monſter as the Friends of the Pontificate make him, would have pointed out a Pope for them to chooſe, or continued them in Priſon. Theſe Things put together make the Election of this Pope ſtill darker; and ſuch contradictory Stories make the Editors, in the Opinion of the ingenious and impartial, but very Triflers.

Pope *Innocent* IV. having obtained the Pontifical Chair, preſently projects the Chaſtiſement of the Emperor *Frideric*, (a very ſlender Token of antecedent Friendſhip between them!) which that he might perform with the greater Plauſibility and Form, he propoſes to do it in a General Council. But this the Emperor's Power in *Italy* prevents. The Pope therefore embarks in a *Genoeſe* Ship, *A. D.* 1244. and ſafely arrives in *France*, where the Year following at *Lyons* he calls a General Council, to which he ſummons the Emperor, who ſent Ad-

Advocates to defend his Cauſe; among whom, one *Thadæus*, an eloquent and learned Man, ſo well behav'd himſelf in the Emperor's Cauſe, that he refuted the Reaſons and Arguments objected againſt his Maſter. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 1. *p.* 635. But he might as well have ſaid nothing. The Pope proſecutes furiouſly, and the Council determine in Prejudice of the Emperor, who is excommunicated in this Form----- "We declare and pronounce the fore-"ſaid Prince, who hath render'd himſelf unworthy "of Imperial and Regal Dignity, and who by his "Iniquities is rejected by God from governing, "excommunicate, and ſententially deprive him "of all Honour and Dignity; abſolving all thoſe "who were under any Obligation of paying Al-"legiance to him from their Oath: And, by Ver-"tue of our Apoſtolick Authority, we ſtrictly "forbid every one for the future to obey or regard "him as Emperor or King, and pronounce all "thoſe *ipſo facto* excommunicate, who ſhall adviſe, "aſſiſt or favour him as ſuch. And that thoſe "whoſe Office it is to chooſe an Emperor, have "Liberty to proceed to the Election of a Succeſ-"ſor." *Ibid. p.* 645. This is a memorable Continuation of the *Roman* Pontiff's uſurping the Power of depoſing Princes, nor is it the laſt by many. In this Council Pope *Innocent* was ſure to carry his Point in every Thing he propoſed, relating either to the *Greek* or *Latin* Church. For beſides the great Number of Cardinals, Biſhops, Abbots, and inferior Clergy, there were preſent the Emperor of *Conſtantinople*, and the Patriarchs of *Conſtantinople* and *Antioch*; who are now become Fiefs of the Pontificate of *Rome*; and the Patriarchs no more than her Legate in their own Sees. To ſecure this Conqueſt therefore, which his Predeceſſors had obtained, and which he as ſucceſsfully maintains,

this Pope, to make the *Greek* Empire and Church hold more dependently of the Church of *Rome*, the more earneſtly puſhes on the Recovery of the Eaſtern Empire from the *Saracens*, who had by this Time over-run the greateſt Part of it. In order to which, the laſt Four Canons of this Council were made. The Fourteenth taxes all Eccleſiaſtical Benefices. The Fifteenth obliges all Prelates earneſtly to preſs their People to bequeath in their Wills ſomething toward the Recovery of the Holy-Land, and the Empire of *Romania*, *pro ſuorum Peccaminum Remiſſione*. In this Council Pope *Innocent* IV. created ſeveral Cardinals, and was the firſt that diſtinguiſh'd them by giving the *Red Hat*, in Token, that they ſhould always be ready to ſpend their Blood in Defence of the Chriſtian Religion againſt all Oppoſers, eſpecially *Frideric* II. late Emperor, (as they call him) who had been the great Perſecutor of the *Roman* Church. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 1. *p.* 598. The Emperor ſtill labours under the heavy Reſentment of the Biſhop of *Rome*, which is ſeverely repeated, *A. D.* 1248. in the Council of *Valentia* in *France*; where, in the Preſence of Two Cardinals, and the Biſhops of Four Provinces, there is an Addition to the Second Canon in Prejudice of the Emperor, *viz.* That to the Oath which all are bound to take for Preſervation of the Peace, this be added, "That they ſhall give no Aid, and "ſhew no Favour to that Schiſmatick *Frideric*, Di-"ſturber of the Peace, and Author of Sedition." The Twenty ſecond Canon of this Council goes further, and excommunicates all Clergymen and Prelates who ſhall aſſiſt or favour the Emperor; and if any of them ſhall dare to call him in, they are to be deprived of their Benefices and Dignities; from which Sentence they can be abſolv'd by none, but the Pope himſelf or his ſpecial Mandate.

The

The Year after the Emperor dies, and his Sons *Conrad* and *Manfred*, claiming their hereditary Right, his Holineſs oppoſes them with an Army of *Croiſades*; but not ſucceeding this Way againſt them, he opens his Magazine of *Anathema's*, and excommunicates them both: Notwithſtanding which, *Conrad* ſucceeds his Father *Frideric*, though *Innocent* IV. and *Alexander* IV. oppos'd him; the latter of which intended to have crown'd *William* Earl of *Holland* Anti-Cæſar, but he was ſlain in his Way to *Rome* by the *Friſons*.

[1254.] *Roland* Nephew to Pope *Gregory* IX. and ſomewhat related to *Innocent* III. ſucceeds *Innocent* IV. under the Name of *Alexander* IV. He was as active as any of his Predeceſſors in the Proſecution either of the Hereticks, or the old Quarrel between the Emperor *Frideric* and the Popes during that Time; and that he may ſeem to outdo his Predeceſſors, he falls heavily on the Hereticks by his Legate *Peter de Lamballe* in the Council of *Albia*, where, in the Sixth Canon, the more to terrify People from entertaining or favouring Hereticks, it is decreed, That the Houſe wherein a Heretick ſhall be found ſhall be deſtroyed, and the Ground whereon it ſtood confiſcated. In the Twenty fifth Canon, That if it ſhall appear, that any one died in Hereſy, his dead Body ſhall be digged up and burnt. And in the Twenty ſixth, That the Temporal Power ſhall, under Pain of Eccleſiaſtick Cenſure, be compell'd to confiſcate their Eſtates, and exhumate their Bodies. And to ſhew how abſolute by Degrees this Office of Inquiſition grew, the Twenty eighth Canon plainly demonſtrates; for any Perſon, though but ſuſpected of Hereſy, that being legally ſummoned, as they call it, ſhould abſent or refuſe to appear before the Dioceſan or Inquiſitors, ſhould be condemned as a

Heretick, though nothing was prov'd againſt him. This is arbitrary to the very utmoſt; for, conſidering the Latitude of the Inquiſitors Commiſſion, few Perſons, againſt whom they had any Pique, could eſcape their Vulture Claws, where Suſpicion alone ſhall be counted a Crime, and for their bare abſenting incur the Sentence. There is one Thing at the End of this Council worth noting. *Coſſart*, obſerving from *Dacherius* the exact Time of this Council, ſays, it was called at *Albia* by the Command of *Lewis* King of the *Franks*. Hence it is plain, that though the Popes by their Legates held Councils in *France*, and preſided in them by their Legates, yet they were call'd by the expreſs Command of the King. *Con. Tom.* XI. *par.* 1. *p.* 738.

In the Pontificate of this Pope was that memorable Quarrel between the Sorboniſts, and the Friars Mendicants, and Preachers; in which, Pope *Alexander* IV. moſt ignominiouſly diſtinguiſh'd himſelf in Favour of thoſe Wretches, whom the Sorboniſts, arm'd with Juſtice and Truth, moſt ſtrenuouſly oppos'd. The Diſpute lay between the Univerſity of *Paris* in general and the foreſaid Friars, though the College of *Sorbon* were moſt conſpicuous in it, and particularly *William de St. Amore*, a learned Doctor thereof. Theſe Preachers and Mendicants, through the Bigotry and Indulgence of ſeveral Princes and People, for ſome Time rambled uncontroul'd, taking upon them to confeſs and preach wherever they came, without the Conſent of the Biſhop, utterly deſpiſing all Canons and Eccleſiaſtical Rules; and profeſſing voluntary Poverty, and Contempt of Riches, wandering like Strollers from Place to Place, under a Pretence of Piety, they chous'd the ſilly People of their Money. At laſt they would pretend to teach the Youth in the Univerſity, but would not be ſubject

to

to the Government of the Univerſity. This was Part of the Quarrel. In the Year 1254, or the Year following, the pious Brethren publiſh'd a Book, which they pretend was written by *John* of *Parma*, General of the *Minorites*, call'd, *The Eternal Goſpel, or the Goſpel of the Holy Ghoſt*; in which, according to *William de St. Amore*, in his Book, *De Periculis noviſſimorum Temporum, &c. c.* 8. *p.* 8. which he wrote in Anſwer to them, they affirmed, *That the Eternal Goſpel, or Goſpel of the Holy Ghoſt, was more perfect, and better, than the Goſpel of Chriſt; and that upon its Appearance the Goſpel of Chriſt ſhould be void.* But becauſe his Holineſs the Pope was immediately applied to and concerned in this Caſe, I will be ſomewhat the more particular in the dangerous and blaſphemous Tenets of this Book from the Authority of *Matt. Paris, ad Ann.* 1257. *p.* 939. *Nic. Eymeric. Director, Inquiſit. par.* 2. *quæſt.* 9. *ſect.* 4. *Bulæi Hiſtor. Univerſ. Pariſ. T.* III. *p.* 330. *& Uſher. de Chriſt. Eccl. Succeſſ. c.* 9. *ſect.* 19, 20, 21. *&c.* Beſides the foreſaid blaſphemous Opinions, this Book held, *That the Eternal Goſpel excelled the Old and New Teſtament, which would hold in Force no longer than the Year* 1260, *after which, all would be in a State of Perfection: That none were fit to inſtruct People in Spiritual Matters and Eternal Salvation but they that went barefoot*; (a neceſſary Qualification indeed for a Preacher, or a Confeſſor!) *That Chriſt and the Holy Apoſtles were not perfect in a contemplative Life, and that the contemplative Life began firſt to fructify under* Joachim *the Abbot, and improve under his Succeſſors.* The Pariſian Academicks abhorring theſe execrable Blaſphemies, unanimouſly agree to extirpate theſe damnable Doctrines; in order to which they condemn the Book, and expel the Friars, and ſend Delegates to the Pope to juſtify their Proceedings. The Matter being ſo very flagitious, his Holineſs

conſents to the condemning the Book, but would have it done ſo privately, that it might not ſcandalize the Friars; ſo tenderly did the *good Man* treat his Creatures, though the worſt of humane Race, and raging even to Madneſs againſt the Chriſtian Religion. The *Pariſians* continuing reſolute in their Decrees againſt the Friars, the good Pope, *A. D.* 1256, ſends a Letter to them, wherein he ſeverely reprehends them, and eſpecially *William de S. Amore*, their chief Champion: But the Academicks continuing their former Reſolution in Defence of the Chriſtian Religion againſt this Antichriſtian Monarch, to ſhew whom he ſerv'd, he degrades *William*, and Three other Doctors, and deprives them of all Eccleſiaſtical Dignities; and taking the Advantage of good King *Lewis*'s Eaſineſs and Bigotry, he procures their Baniſhment. This Treatment does not in the leaſt abate the Courage of the Sufferers. *William de S. Amore* writes a ſarcatical Invective againſt the Friars, wherein he expoſes their Knaveries to the World, and very ſeverely reproaches the Pope for his unreaſonable Pride. This Book, which was, *De Periculis noviſſimorum Temporum, adverſus Mendicantes*, (as has been mentioned) was, with the Author, condemned of Hereſy, and by the expreſs Order of Pope *Alexander* IV. burnt at *Rome* and *Paris*. *William* not diſcouraged at this, purſues his Reſentment againſt the Friars, exhorting all People to forbear their Benevolence to them, for it was no way meritorious to relieve a Pack of luſty lazy Monks, and who, to the great Prejudice and Scandal of Parochial Prieſts, had unlawfully uſurp'd the Office of Preaching and Confeſſing. Pope *Alexander* being ſtill more incens'd againſt him, makes a home Blow at him; and prevail'd ſo far, as to have him baniſhed all Parts of the King of

France's

France's Dominions, and forbids him to write or teach, under Pain of Excommunication. The good Man dies ſoon after this, and is by the Friars, Preachers, and Mendicants, regiſtred among the Hereticks; but *Laurentius Anglicus*, the Abbot, bravely defended his Memory againſt theſe prattling Wretches, and ſucceeds *William de St. Amore* in his Reſentment, being a terrible Scourge and irreconcileable Enemy to the lazy Friars. The Editors in the Life of this Pope give a very gentle Touch of this Matter, by ſaying, *That he was ſo great a Favourer of the Poor, that he would not allow any Books to be written againſt them.* Con. Tom. XI. par. 1. p. 716. This in it ſelf is the moſt inſipid and unneceſſary Piece of Flattery that could be daub'd upon his Memory; and is ſo far from being an Addition to his Character, that it directly implies a Diminution of it: For as he muſt be a very ill Man that ſhould write againſt the Poor; ſo conſequently he that can prevent any ſuch Writing, and does not, is equally as bad. But this is not the Caſe: The Poor they here mean cannot be imagined to be the wretched, diſtreſſed, hungry, naked, ſtarving Poor, againſt whom no Man, I dare affirm, to this Day ever wrote a Treatiſe; but they were the lazy, vagabond, ſtrolling, poor, mendicant Friars; and the Books wrote againſt them, which he would not allow, were what honeſt orthodox *William de S. Amore* publiſh'd. This is ſtill diſingenuous Dealing in the Editors, and I fear we ſhall not find them more ſincere the further we go.

In the Year 1260, the Editors pretend a Council at *Arles*, under *Florentine* the Archbiſhop thereof, and his Suffragans. There is no Account or Hiſtory of this Council either in the Title or Preface to it, as is uſual in others; only *Coſſart* at the End

of it very lamely and impertinently fixes the Time of it from Part of the Preface, which is nothing to the Purpoſe. *Con. T.* XI. *par.* 2. *p.* 2361. The Words from whence he concludes the Date of this Council are theſe, *Secundam attribuunt Filio, & duravit Annis* MCCLX. This relates no Way to the Time of the Council, but only to the Time which the Old and New Teſtament ſhould laſt, which, according to the *Evangelium Æternum*, lately mentioned, was no longer than the Year MCCLX. ſo that *Coſſart* had better have relied wholly on the Authority of the *Codex Chiſianus*, than have introduced a Citation nothing to Purpoſe. But the true Reaſon for introducing this Council, I am very apt to think, was to reinforce an old Forgery, which was foiſted into the Fourth Council of *Carthage*, *A. D.* 399. The Hundredth Canon of which, according to *Gratian* and *Peter Lombard*, Two Brethren in Iniquity, allows Lay-Baptiſm in Caſe of Neceſſity; which we have ſufficiently already confuted. *Vid. ſupra.* Now I cannot ſee for what End this Council is brought in here, except for the Sake of the Second Canon of it; which plainly allows the ſame; for it ſays, *That on Holidays the Pariſh-Prieſt ſhall inſtruct their Pariſhioners how, and in what Form of Words they ſhall baptize their Children in Caſe of Neceſſity.* Here is Miſſion and Function diſpens'd at once by a private Prieſt, who himſelf muſt receive them both from a Biſhop, who alone has Power to give them. I wiſh ſuch Irregularities and Innovations have not given an Opportunity to the many Sectaries later Ages have produced, to aſſume thoſe Characters which do not belong to them.

This Year likewiſe the Editors introduce a peremptory Edict of this Pope's, call'd *Conſtitutio Cypria*; not ſaid to be decreed in any Council, but the

the ſimple Act of the ſupream Pontiff, and that it may ſtand as a laſting Precedent, bears this Title, *Alexander Epiſcopus, Servus Servorum Dei, ad futuram Rei Memoriam.* The State of the *Greek* Church was now become moſt deplorable; and, to keep it in an entire Subjection to that of *Rome*, the Sovereign Biſhop publiſhes this Conſtitution by Vertue of his ſingle Authority, though ſubſcribed to by ſeveral Cardinals; for the whole Conſtitution carries an Air of Monarchy throughout; and no *Greek* Biſhop in the Iſle of *Cyprus* was to be allowed as ſuch, unleſs confirmed by a Biſhop of the *Latin* Church, who was to receive his Profeſſion of Canonical Obedience to the Church of *Rome*. It is, in ſhort, as enſlaving an Edict as ever paſſed from the Mouth of the moſt Arbitrary Tyrant; and his cajoling the poor *Greek* Biſhops, in calling them Brethren, is as ridiculous a Banter as his calling himſelf their Brother, whilſt he Lords it over them in the moſt domineering Manner.

As to the Temporal Affairs of this Pope, he is no leſs vigorous in the Proſecution of them than any of his Predeceſſors. In the Third Year of his Pontificate he excommunicated the Electors that adhered to the Intereſt of *Conrardine*, Nephew to the Emperor *Frederick* II. And the ſame Year being very much diſtreſſed by *Manfred*, he commands *Henry* III. King of *England*, to aſſiſt him in the Recovery of *Sicily*, under Pain of Excommunication. And becauſe the *Florentines* and *Genoeſe* would not violate the League they had made with *Manfred*, he anathematizes both. At laſt, in vain attempting to reconcile the *Venetians* and *Genoeſe*, whoſe Differences had much retarded the Proſecution of his own Affairs, he paid the laſt Debt to Nature, and is ſucceeded by

[1261.] *Urban* IV. before call'd *James Pantaleon*,

a *French*-man by Nation; who, though of mean Parentage, by hard Study and aſſiduous Application to Buſineſs, ſoon became eminent in the Court of *Rome*, being, after ſeveral Promotions in the Church, by his Predeceſſor Pope *Alexander* IV. deputed his Legate in *Pomerania*, *Pruſſia*, *Livonia*, and all *Germany*. The Year after his Advancement to the Pontificate, he proſecutes the old Quarrel between the late Pope and *Manfred* King of *Sicily*, whom he excommunicates, promiſing a plenary Indulgence and Remiſſion of Sins to all who ſhould arm againſt him; ſucceeding his Predeceſſors in their Temporal Uſurpations; though otherwiſe a Man of polite Genius; which, according to *Stella*, was very becoming: For being reproached upon the Obſcurity of his Birth, (his Father being but a Cobbler by Trade) he very wittily and juſtly replied, *A Man was not born noble, but became ſo by his virtuous Acquiſitions.*

[1265.] *Clement* IV. before call'd *Guido Falcodius*, being Legate to *Urban* IV. in *England*, was, upon the Vacancy of the See, choſen Pope. A Man of a very fair Character, bating his Reſentment to the Family of the Emperor *Friderick*, and the Uſurpation of the *Roman* Patriarchate on the Eccleſiaſtick and Civil Power. He was a *French*-man by Nation, bred up to the Civil Law, in which he became an eminent Advocate, and was afterwards a Counſellor to the King of *France*, in which Promotion he married, and had Two Daughters; but upon the Death of his Wife, he renounc'd the World; and for his ſingular Morality and Piety was made Biſhop of *Le Puy*, afterwards Archbiſhop of *Narbon*, and then Cardinal-Biſhop of *Sabina*. Upon his Promotion to the Prime See, he ſhew'd great Humility; and was ſo far from encouraging any Thing like Nepotiſm, (a Practice

of

of later Times) that he diſpoſed of his Two Daughters without Robbing the Church to raiſe their Fortunes; giving to each but Thirty Pounds: And marrying one to a Plebeian, he plac'd the other in a Monaſtry.

In the Year 1267, a Council was call'd at *Vienna* by Cardinal *Guido* the Pope's Legate: In which there were Nineteen Canons made, and ſeveral of them very good: But the Ninth reſerves a diſpenſing Power to the Apoſtolick See in a moſt irregular Enormity; for, declaring expreſly againſt conferring Benefices, with Cures of Souls, on Minors of Eighteen Years of Age, the ſame Canon reſerves a Power of diſpenſing with it in the Apoſtolick See or her Legates, contrary to the Practice of the Primitive Fathers. From whence, as has been before obſerved, ſo many even in Swadling-Clothes have in later Times been promoted to the higheſt Dignities in the Church. There is likewiſe another Reſerve of Power to the Holy See in the Thirteenth Canon; where, upon the repeated Complaints of the Irregularities of the Black Monks of St. *Benedict*'s Order, after a ſtrict Charge to the Biſhops of the Province of *Saltzburg*, and the Biſhop of *Prague*, or any of them, to viſit and reform all Abuſes in the foreſaid Monks, thoſe are excepted who are under the immediate Cognizance of the Biſhop of *Rome*, who are to be viſited only by his Holineſs, or his Legates: Which is no better than encouraging Rebellion in each particular Diſtrict, and very oppoſite to the Diſcipline of more regular and ancient Ages, which ſubjected all Regulars to the Viſitation of their proper Dioceſan.

Coſſart, in his Note at the End of the Council of *Loudon*, which was held there *A. D.* 1268. after ſomething ſaid to little Purpoſe, is guilty of a moſt

a *French*-man by Nation; who, though of mean Parentage, by hard Study and aſſiduous Application to Buſineſs, ſoon became eminent in the Court of *Rome*, being, after ſeveral Promotions in the Church, by his Predeceſſor Pope *Alexander* IV. deputed his Legate in *Pomerania*, *Pruſſia*, *Livonia*, and all *Germany*. The Year after his Advancement to the Pontificate, he proſecutes the old Quarrel between the late Pope and *Manfred* King of *Sicily*, whom he excommunicates, promiſing a plenary Indulgence and Remiſſion of Sins to all who ſhould arm againſt him; ſucceeding his Predeceſſors in their Temporal Uſurpations; though otherwiſe a Man of polite Genius; which, according to *Stella*, was very becoming: For being reproached upon the Obſcurity of his Birth, (his Father being but a Cobbler by Trade) he very wittily and juſtly replied, *A Man was not born noble, but became ſo by his virtuous Acquiſitions.*

[1265.] *Clement* IV. before call'd *Guido Falcodius*, being Legate to *Urban* IV. in *England*, was, upon the Vacancy of the See, choſen Pope. A Man of a very fair Character, bating his Reſentment to the Family of the Emperor *Friderick*, and the Uſurpation of the *Roman* Patriarchate on the Eccleſiaſtick and Civil Power. He was a *French*-man by Nation, bred up to the Civil Law, in which he became an eminent Advocate, and was afterwards a Counſellor to the King of *France*, in which Promotion he married, and had Two Daughters; but upon the Death of his Wife, he renounc'd the World; and for his ſingular Morality and Piety was made Biſhop of *Le Puy*, afterwards Archbiſhop of *Narbon*, and then Cardinal-Biſhop of *Sabina*. Upon his Promotion to the Prime See, he ſhew'd great Humility; and was ſo far from encouraging any Thing like Nepotiſm, (a Practice

of

of later Times) that he diſpoſed of his Two Daughters without Robbing the Church to raiſe their Fortunes; giving to each but Thirty Pounds: And marrying one to a Plebeian, he plac'd the other in a Monaſtry.

In the Year 1267, a Council was call'd at *Vienna* by Cardinal *Guido* the Pope's Legate: In which there were Nineteen Canons made, and ſeveral of them very good: But the Ninth reſerves a diſpenſing Power to the Apoſtolick See in a moſt irregular Enormity; for, declaring expreſly againſt conferring Benefices, with Cures of Souls, on Minors of Eighteen Years of Age, the ſame Canon reſerves a Power of diſpenſing with it in the Apoſtolick See or her Legates, contrary to the Practice of the Primitive Fathers. From whence, as has been before obſerved, ſo many even in Swaddling-Clothes have in later Times been promoted to the higheſt Dignities in the Church. There is likewiſe another Reſerve of Power to the Holy See in the Thirteenth Canon; where, upon the repeated Complaints of the Irregularities of the Black Monks of St. *Benedict*'s Order, after a ſtrict Charge to the Biſhops of the Province of *Saltzburg*, and the Biſhop of *Prague*, or any of them, to viſit and reform all Abuſes in the foreſaid Monks, thoſe are excepted who are under the immediate Cognizance of the Biſhop of *Rome*, who are to be viſited only by his Holineſs, or his Legates: Which is no better than encouraging Rebellion in each particular Diſtrict, and very oppoſite to the Diſcipline of more regular and ancient Ages, which ſubjected all Regulars to the Viſitation of their proper Dioceſan.

Coſſart, in his Note at the End of the Council of *Loudon*, which was held there *A. D.* 1268. after ſomething ſaid to little Purpoſe, is guilty of a moſt

moſt ridiculous Piece of Malice, by queſtioning the Veracity of our faithful Collector Sir *H. Spelman*, upon an Error which cannot be ſuppos'd his. He calls it *gravis Lapſus in Anglicana Collectione*; and, after all the mighty Expectation this inſignificant Reproach can excite, it is, becauſe it is in *Spelman*, *cap.* 11. *p.* 263. plac'd to the Year MCCXLVIII. whereas it ſhou'd have been to the Year MCCLXVIII. This muſt certainly be the Printer's Fault, and not the Collector's. And whoever hath had Occaſion to peruſe the Second Tome of Sir *H. Spelman's*, will own it to be the moſt uncorrect Book ever printed at *London* before. But *Coſſart* had no Reaſon to take hold on ſuch a poor Occaſion to quarrel with that great Man, (whoſe Integrity as an Editor far outſhines him and his Partner *Labbé*) for the Reader might eaſily ſet himſelf right in Point of Chronology, by the Date of the Council, from Cardinal *Ottoboni*, the Pope's Legate, who preſided in it, and the Reign of the Pope whom he repreſented, which was *Clement* IV. as is expreſs'd in *Spelman*; for the Year of our Lord MCCXLVIII. was the Sixth Year of Pope *Innocent* IV. If it were worth while, I could eaſily recriminate upon *Coſſart* from many ſuch Miſtakes; (not to call them in him, as he does in our *Spelman*, *Graviores Lapſus:*) But the tranſpoſing of a Letter or Figure, though it may often invert the Senſe or Time, being ſo eaſily remediable, eſpecially in the preſent Caſe, I ſhall waſte no further Time about it.

[1271.] After a Vacancy of Three Years and Two Months, *Theobald*, by the Name of *Gregory* X. is promoted to the See of *Rome*, being at that Time with *Edward* Prince of *Wales* in *Paleſtine*. His Pontificate was not illuſtrated with many remarkable Paſſages, the Second general Council of *Lyons* making the greateſt Figure in it. This Council

was call'd chiefly upon the Neceſſity of the Affairs in the Eaſt and in *Greece*; for *Baldwin* the laſt Latin Emperor being driven out of *Conſtantinople*, *Michael Paleologus* is choſen Emperor of *Greece*. The Pope obſerving the drooping State of the *Greek* Empire, takes Advantage of their Neceſſity: For the Emperor *Michael*, afraid of drawing the Weſtern Princes into *Greece* again, ſends Ambaſſadors and Legates from himſelf and the Church, with full Inſtructions to conſent and ſubmit to what ſhould be offered. The Synod began *May* 7. *A. D.* 1274. In which Pope *Gregory* X. preſided. The Three principal Reaſons for celebrating it were theſe: 1. For ſending Succour into the Eaſt. 2. For procuring a Reconciliation between the Weſtern and Eaſtern Churches. 3. For a more ſpeedy and regular Election of a Pope. The indiſpenſable Neceſſity the Emperor *Michael* labour'd under, of ſolliciting Aid from the Weſtern Princes againſt the Infidels, obliged him to many hard Conditions, which otherwiſe the *Greeks* uſed to reject with the laſt Contempt. He not only in his Letters to the Pope pays all Homage and Acknowledgment which the moſt depreſs'd, ſlaviſh, captivated Wretch could do to the Supreme Pontiff, but by his Nuncio takes a formal Oath of Obedience, ſwearing to preſerve inviolably rhe Catholick Faith, as the Church of *Rome* profeſſes and preaches it. He likewiſe recognizes the Supremacy of that Church, and ſwears Canonical Obedience to it. In the ſame Form the Prelates of *Greece* both write an Epiſtle, and by their Legates take the Oath. Theſe were Acts of Neceſſity indeed, on which the Biſhop of *Rome* laid ſo great Streſs, that no Reconciliation was to be expected, (and conſequently no Aid againſt the Infidels) but upon theſe Terms: 1. That the *Roman* Pontiff's Name ſhould

be

be mentioned in their Celebration of the Maſs. 2. That all Appeals from the *Greeks* ſhould be made to the Apoſtolick See. 3. That the *Roman* Pontiff's Supremacy ſhould be acknowledged by all. Theſe Terms the Eaſtern Church always highly ſtomach'd: For, as to the Firſt, it is plain, that in the Time of St. *Chryſoſtome*, at *Conſtantinople*, they recognized their own Patriarch only. As to the Second Article, *viz.* that of Appeals, it was about what the *Greeks* for many Centuries conteſted with the *Romans*; and particularly the *Africans*, who always, whilſt that Church maintained its Glory, own'd and acknowledg'd no Supremacy in the Church of *Rome* that could claim the Right of Appeals, but in her own Diſtrict. The Third Article likewiſe from very primitive Times had been conteſted with them of *Rome*, not only by the *Greek*, but likewiſe by ſeveral Weſtern Patriarchs and Metropolitans, as has been already noted, who would not allow of that arbitrary Supremacy which the Biſhops of *Rome* have claimed in later Times, and which they for many Ages in vain attacked the neighbouring Powers for: But at laſt their large Acquiſitions and Encroachments in Temporals enabled them to compaſs that by Force which they could not obtain by Pretence of Claim. But this extorted Obedience from the State and Church of *Greece* was of but ſhort Continuance, as we ſhall ſhew in its proper Place.

Before I part with this Second General Council of *Lyons*, I muſt beg Leave to recover an Inadvertency which I have committed in the Papacy of Pope *Silveſter* I. *A. D.* 324. *Cabbaſutius*'s being poſitive in the Matter, made me the more ſuſpect the Truth of it; the Diſcovery of which will not be unpleaſant to the Reader. At the End of this Council, *Cabbaſutius*, *p.* 489. has a Diſſertation concern-

cerning the Election of a Pope and Cardinals; which pretending to fortify by unjuſt Authorities and impertinent Proofs, will be worth while to make a ſtrict Inſpection into; by doing which, I ſhall likewiſe recover a Forgery in the Fourth Century, which I inadvertently omitted.

Conſidering the frequent Interruptions in the Succeſſion of Popes, the many illegal and ſchiſmatical Elections, and the ſimoniacal and other unwarrantable Means us'd to obtain the Papacy, *Cabbaſutius* had much better have been ſilent; for till they had fix'd the Power of electing the Biſhop of *Rome* in the College of Cardinals, he does but aggravate the Irregularities of Elections, inſtead of juſtifying them from the Authority of St. *Cyprian*. The good Opinion this Father had of Pope *Cornelius*, and of the Legality of his Election, appears from the ſeveral Epiſtles he wrote to, and concerning him. He allows him to be made a Biſhop, *de Dei & Chriſti ejus Judicio, de Clericorum pene omnium Teſtimonio, de Plebis, quæ tum adfuit, Suffragio, & de antiquorum Sacerdotum & bonorum Virorum Collegio.* Ep. 52. *By the Decree of God and his Chriſt, by the Teſtimony of almoſt all the Clergy, by the Conſent of the People preſent, and by the Congregation of the ancient Prieſts and good Men.* To this he ſubjoins the Fourth and Sixth Canons of the Firſt *Nicene* Council, and the Ninety ſecond Epiſtle of Pope *Leo* to *Ruſticus*: All which agree in the ancient Manner of Electing a Biſhop, which is very different from that of the College of Cardinals. He goes on with the Interruption of this Method of Electing, by the Interpoſing Authority of the Emperors, as in the Caſe of *Damaſus* and *Urſicinus*, decided by the Emperor *Valentinian*; that of *Boniface* and *Eulalius*, by *Honorius*; and that of *Symmachus* and *Laurence*, by *Theo-*

doric the *Gothick* Emperor. Afterwards *Juſtinian*, having recovered *Italy* from the *Goths*, would not admit a Pope to be choſen without his Approbation; which Cuſtom continued till *Conſtantine*'s Time. He is miſtaken in what he ſays of *Charlemain*'s reſtoring the *Roman* Church to her Liberty, if he means that of electing a Biſhop; for not only he, but his Son *Lewis* the Holy, his Grandſon *Lotharius*, and ſeveral others, his Succeſſors, nam'd 'em to the Time of *Otho* I. who depoſed *John* XII. and put *Leo* VIII. in his Room. What *Cabbaſutius* hath hitherto ſaid, has rather deſtroyed than ſtrengthened the Power of electing the Pope by the Conclave of Cardinals, for hitherto he does not find them mentioned. But to give a Face of Antiquity to this Innovation, he tells us, *p.* 490. § 6. it is not certain when the Choice of the Supream Biſhop devolved upon the Cardinals; tho' it is very probable it might be upon the Inauguration of *Leo* IX. in whoſe Promotion *Hildebrand*, afterwards Pope by the Name of *Gregory* VII. was very inſtrumental. And yet he allows it as uncertain, whether before or after *Otho* I. the Power of Electing the Pope was in the Breaſt of the Conclave, or not. The Authority of *Peter Damiani* and others are invalid, as being of later Times; and his Alluſion of the Neceſſity of their aſſiſting the Supream Biſhop in Council from St. *Chryſoſtome*, is altogether impertinent. For although that Father, *Hom. ad c.* 1. *Act. Apoſt.* ſays, That St. *Peter* did nothing of Moment by Vertue of his own Authority, but by Conſent of the Brethren; as in the Election of the Succeſſor of *Judas* to the Apoſtleſhip; in the Election of the Seven Deacons; and in the Diſpute about the Obſervation of Things lawful: Yet he, *viz. Cabbaſutius*, makes a falſe Inference, that from thence it is plain that the Conclave derive their Power, *&c.*

For

For in the Caſe of *Judas*'s Succeſſor to the Apoſtleſhip, it is evident from the Text, that the Matter was ſynodically performed, and was the firſt Council held in the Church after our Bleſſed Lord's Aſcenſion. As to the Caſe of the Election of the Seven Deacons, it was purely relating to Ordination; and the Diſpute about the Obſervation of Things lawful was another ſynodical Act; which is by the Editors themſelves allowed to be the Third Synod of the Apoſtles. So that theſe Alluſions do no way affect the Neceſſity or Antiquity of the Conclave; which is more apparently demonſtrated to be an Innovation from the Authority of a forged Council, than from any Thing elſe. In this ſame Diſſertation of *Cabbaſutius*, § 9. he pretends to derive the Name of Cardinal from very ancient Time, *viz.* from the Papacy of *Sylveſter* I. *A. D.* 324. In which Year the Editors pretend a Council held at *Rome* under Pope *Sylveſter*; in which there were Twenty Canons made, the Sixth of which mentions the Seven Cardinal-Deacons of *Rome*. This *Cabbaſutius* endeavours to enforce in *p.* 124. But his Authority is notoriouſly falſe; for this Council and Canons are a plain Forgery: To which, after a faint Acknowledgment of *Crab*, *Surius*, *Nicolinus*, and *Binius*, *Labbé* in the Margin concedes in theſe Words: "Theſe Canons are eſteemed counterfeit "by *Hincmar*, and other learned Men, which *Iſidore* "hath put into his Collection." But before we proceed further to enervate the Authority of this Council, it will be neceſſary to ſhew for what Ends it was forg'd. The Firſt Canon was invented to prove that ridiculous Fable of *Conſtantine*'s being baptized by *Silveſter*, (though it is well known he was born of Chriſtian Parents) and of his being miraculouſly cleans'd of a Leproſy he never had. The Author of this Canon unwarily tells us, That

no Lay-Perſons were there; and yet in the very next Paragraph he ſays, *Calfurnius* Governor of *Rome* was preſent at this Council; and, Can. 10. That he ſubſcribed to it. Cardinal *Bellarmine*, *l.* 1. *de Cler. c.* 13. cites the Third Canon, to prove the Order of Exorciſts to be an Eccleſiaſtick Order, and that anciently there were Seven Eccleſiaſtick Orders. He likewiſe, *ib. c.* 11. cites the Fifth Canon, to prove the Chriſm to be the Material of the Sacrament of Confirmation, and that it ought to be conſecrated. The Sixth Canon is alſo cited by him, *ib. c.* 16. to prove the Antiquity of Cardinals: The Eighth, to prove Celibacy neceſſary to Holy Orders: And the laſt, *l.* 2. *de Con. c.* 17. to prove, That the Biſhop of *Rome* is above any Council; and alſo, *l.* 2. *de Rom. Pont. c.* 26. to prove, That he ought to be judged of none. Theſe were the great Ends of inventing this Council. As to the Authority of this Council, *Bellarmine* can produce none more early than that of *Nicolaus Myſticus*, who liv'd above 500 Years after this Council is ſaid to be held. Beſides, the Title of it renders it ſtill more ſuſpicious; for it ſays, That the Council of *Nice* was call'd by this Pope, which is poſitively falſe, the *Roman* Editors themſelves not agreeing in what Pope's Time it was held; and it is apparently known that the Emperor *Conſtantine* call'd it. The Fable of this Emperor's being baptiz'd by *Silveſter*, and cleans'd of a Leproſy by him, mention'd in the Firſt Canon, is ſufficient to deſtroy the Credit of it; for *Euſebius*, who was Cotemporary with *Conſtantine*, and highly eſteemed by him, would not have omitted ſuch remarkable Paſſages, had they been true; nor do any of the later *Roman* Authors who write of the Pontificate, particularly *Canus*, *Platina*, *Alciatus*, and *Vives*, make any Mention of it, except the laſt, who calls

it a direct Fable. *L.* 5. *de Cauſ. Corrupt. Artium.* Upon ſuch Authority as this do the Editors found their Innovations; but till they can produce more authentick Proofs for what they affirm, they ought to excuſe any Man's Belief.

The Two next Popes after *Gregory* X *viz. Innocent* V. and *Hadrian* V. ſat but Six Months; and therefore little can be ſaid of them: Nor was the Pontifical Chair enjoy'd much longer by

[1277.] *John* XXI. before called *Peter Julian*, a Man well vers'd in all Kinds of Learning, eſpecially Phyſick, wherein he acquir'd great Reputation: Laying which aſide, he enter'd into Holy Orders, and became ſoon after Cardinal Biſhop of *Tuſculum*; from whence, upon the Death of *Hadrian* V. he was promoted to the See of *Rome*: And, notwithſtanding the great Weight of Buſineſs which attends that Promotion, he cloſely follow'd his Studies; for he wrote a Treatiſe called, *The Poor Man's Treaſure*; and ſeveral Tracts of Logick and other Things. He was mightily delighted with Aſtrology, and the Art of calculating Nativities; in which he went ſo far as to draw his own Horoſcope, which promis'd him a long Life; but his Infallibility was much miſtaken; for at the ſame Time the Roof of the Chamber falling in, he was miſerably bruiſed, in which Condition he languiſh'd a while, and then dy'd. The Editors, *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 1. *p.* 1030. from *Siffrid*, *l.* 2. tells us, That this Pope was writing a certain Heretical Book at the Time that he was kill'd by the Fall of the Roof. *Which*, ſay they, *if true, ſhews the great Providence by which God governs his Church.* Which, I ſuppoſe, they mean in the juſt Judgment of God upon this Heretical Pope.

[1277.] *John Cajetan*, Cardinal-Deacon of S. *Nicolas*, after a Vacancy of Six Months, and

much Difficulty, takes Poſſeſſion of the Apoſtolick See under the Name of *Nicolas* III. His chief Opponent was *Charles* King of *Sicily*, Senator of *Rome*, and Preſident of the Holy Chamber; who earneſtly inſiſted upon the Election of a *Frenchman*; but *Cajetan*'s Intereſt being ſuperior to King *Charles*'s, he aſcends the Papal Throne, and to make *Charles* ſenſible of the Pontifical Reſentment, in the Beginning of his Reign, he deprives him of the Vicarſhip of *Hetruria*, and the Senatorial Dignity; with a ſtrict Injunction, that no Prince for the future ſhould aſſume that Honour.

In the Year 1279, a Council was held at *Buda* in *Hungary*, in which one *Philip*, Legate to Pope *Nicolas* III. preſided. In Purſuance of the Act of Image-Worſhip, before eſtabliſh'd by the Biſhop of *Rome*, the Thirteenth Canon of this Council obliges all Clergymen, when they appear before the Figure or Image of the Bleſſed Virgin, or the Crucifix, to bow their Heads, and inſtruct the Laity to do the like. Likewiſe, when they hear the *Ave Mary* pronounc'd, they are to kneel.

The Year following a Council was held at *Santon*, in the Seventh Canon of which the Adoration of the Euchariſt is injoin'd the Laity; obliging them, wherever they ſhall ſee the Body of Chriſt carried, they ſhall kneel and pray.

[1281.] *Martin* II. or, as ſome will, IV. before called *Simon de Bria*, ſucceeds *Nicolas* III. of whom there is little ſaid by the Editors. The moſt remarkable Thing during his Pontificate was the Council of *Niſmes*, *A. D.* 1284, in which the old Error of Lay-Baptiſm, unjuſtly father'd on the Fourth Council of *Carthage*, *A. D* 398, (to which I refer the Reader) is reviv'd, and amply enlarg'd and confirm'd in the Firſt Canon. The Ninety ninth and One hundredth Canons of the Fourth Coun-

Council of *Carthage*, positively forbid a Woman to teach and baptize, tho' *Gratian* and *Peter Lombard* have unjustly added an Exception to the latter, *nisi urgente Necessitate*, which never belong'd to it. *Binius*, *Longus a Coriolano*, and *Labbée*, tho' they leave out the Exception mentioned by *Gratian* and *Peter Lombard*, strenuously assert the Article of Baptism by Lay-Hands *in Case of Necessity*. With them *Bellarmine*, *de Baptismo*, *l.* 1. *c.* 7. joins; to which Forgery they add another in their Notes, at least it is imply'd in them; for they say, *By a Woman being forbid to baptize, is only meant in the Presence of the Priests or Clergy, as appears from the preceding Canon; or except in Case of Necessity, as* Peter Lombard *and* Gratian *expound this Canon. For as the Apostle* Paul, 1 Cor. c. 14. & 1 Tim. c. 2. *forbids Women, except in Case of Necessity, to teach or speak; so the Fathers of this Council permit Women in Case of Necessity to baptize, no Priest or Clergyman being present. Since therefore the Power of Baptizing is forbid to Women, except in Case of Necessity, we may very justly object the Determination of the Council of* Florence *against* Calvin; *that not only the Clergy but the Laity, not only Men but Women, have Power in Case of Necessity to administer the Sacrament of Baptism, though contrary to the solemn Præscripts of the Church.* Thus the Notes. In which there is a Mass of Absurdities, Forgeries, and Lies, too gross for the most bigotted Inclination. For, in the first Place, to say, that by Women's being forbid to baptize, is only meant in the Presence of the Clergy, is the most distorted Explanation, and most opposite to the Text, that can be invented; which positively in these few Words says, *A Woman shall not baptize*; which can admit of no other Meaning than what the Words express. Secondly, they are very impolitick to impose so palpable a Forgery on the World, as in these Words [as appears from the

preceding Canon.] After this Way of arguing, they would perſuade the World into an Opinion of Impudence, and that it is a Virtue, or they would not dare to juſtify their falſe Interpretations by ſo direct Forgeries. The *preceding Canon* they mention is very wide of the Matter; for that forbids Lay-Men to teach in the Preſence of the Clergy, except at the Command of the Clergy. What the Canon in Diſpute ſpeaks of, is Baptizing, which is the Adminiſtration of a Sacrament; ſo that this is nothing to their Purpoſe. They have indeed taken an unwarrantable Freedom of augmenting the Number of the Sacraments, but this of Teaching has not yet come within their Catalogue. But, Thirdly, as one Miſchief is uſually attended with another, ſo in this Caſe, to ſtrengthen one Falſity, they introduce another. They affirm, That St. *Paul* allows Women in Caſe of Neceſſity to baptize, 1 *Cor.* 14. 1 *Tim.* 2. and from thence juſtify this Forgery of *Gratian* and *Peter Lombard*. How falſe this is, and how impiouſly they have traduc'd the Great Apoſtle, let the Reader judge from the two Epiſtles cited. In 1 *Cor. c.* 14. *v.* 34, 35. St. *Paul* ſays, *Let your Women keep Silence in the Churches, for it is not permitted unto them to ſpeak, but to be ſubject, as the Law alſo ſaith. And, if they will learn any Thing, let them ask their Husbands at Home; for it is a Shame for Women to ſpeak in the Church.* And in 1 *Tim. c.* 2. *v.* 11, 12. he ſays, *Let the Woman learn in Silence with all Subjection. I permit not a Woman to teach, neither to uſurp Authority over the Man, but to be in Silence.* Theſe Texts are plain and poſitive; and it is very unlikely St. *Paul* ſhould in any Part of the Context contradict himſelf; as it is moſt certain he doth not.

But to return to the Council of *Niſmes*: The Firſt Canon of which not only corroborates, but en-

enlarges the Liberty of Lay-Baptiſm, by impowering them to uſe the Form of Words preſcrib'd in the Office of Baptiſm, *viz.* In the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt, I baptize thee: And if a Prieſt ſhall find an Infant thus baptiz'd by Lay-Hands, Man or Woman, Father or Mother, in Caſe of Neceſſity, it ſhall be eſteem'd valid, and he ſhall not rebaptize the Child. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 1. *p.* 1201, 1202. The Unreaſonableneſs of this Practice makes the Fact invalid. For if the Laity aſſume the Office of the Prieſthood, as they are unqualified, the Act of Baptiſm is in it ſelf null; and conſequently the Infant or Perſon ſo baptiz'd is not the better for it; but is as much, in the Caſe of Baptiſm, left to the Mercy of God, as it would be if it ſhould die without it. It is the Commiſſion, the lawful Call alone, that juſtifies the Agent in his Office; and, as in all other Caſes, ſo in this, he that acts without a Commiſſion or lawful Power is an Impoſtor, and all his Acts are ineffectual and void in themſelves.

[1285.] *Honorius* IV. before called *Jacobus de Sabello*, is from Cardinal-Deacon in *Coſmedin* promoted to the Papal Dignity. In whoſe Time, in the Council of *Wirtzburg*, called *Concilium Herbipolenſe*, and held *A. D.* 1287. the Adoration of the Hoſt, which we mentioned juſt before in the Council of *Santon*, is more expreſly injoin'd than before. This Council was intirely the Pope's, for *John* of *Tuſculum* his Legate preſided in it; and to add to the Solemnity of it, *Rodolph* the Emperor, with ſeveral of the *German* Nobility, was preſent at it. The Eighth Chapter or Canon enjoins the Method of the Proceſſion and Adoration in theſe Words. "When it ſhall happen that the moſt Holy Body "of Chriſt is carried out of the Body of the Church "to ſick Perſons, or Women near their Time of

De-

" Delivery, we demand a due Veneration of it; " *viz.* the Prieſt, having his Surplice on, and his " Stole about his Neck, ſhall carry it, if the Cir- " cumſtance of Time and Place will permit, a " Clerk going before with a Taper and a little " Bell; and they that meet the Hoſt are to kneel " while the Prieſt paſſes by, and devoutly ſay " Three Pater-noſter's at leaſt, with the Salutation " of the Bleſſed Virgin: And thoſe of them who " perform this Injunction, that ſhall be under Pen- " nance or Confeſſion at that Time, ſhall, by Vir- " tue of our Authority, have Ten Days of their " Pennance remitted: And the Prieſt who ſhall " preſume to carry the Hoſt otherwiſe, ſhall be " puniſh'd at the Will of his Ordinary. *Con. T.* 11. " *Par.* 2. *p.* 1322.

[1288.] *Nicolas* IV. otherwiſe called *Jerome*, was the greateſt Ornament of the Pontifical Chair for many Ages, being eminent for his Piety and Learning. He was ſollicitous for the promoting a good Underſtanding among Chriſtian Princes, witneſs his reconciling the Kings of *Arragon* and *Naples*; and indefatigably ſedulous in propagating the Chriſtian Religion among the *Tartars*, *Armenians*, and *Æthiopians*, with the firſt of which he did not loſe his Labour. He earneſtly preſs'd the *Chriſtian* Princes for the Relief of what was left of the Holy-Land, ſetting them a glorious Example in himſelf, by ſending a great Number of Men at his own Charge. King *Edward* I. of *England*, ſtimulated by ſo fair a Precedent, calls a Council at *London*, in which having decreed the Extirpation of the *Jews* out of his Country, he calls upon the Clergy for a Subſidy towards carrying on the War in the Holy-Land; but tacked an Injunction to it, That no Perſon ſhould give any Eſtate to the Monks, or ſell any Poſſeſſions to them, or any other Prieſts,

(being

(being ſenſible or jealous of their preſent and growing Greatneſs.) Pope *Nicolas*, too much in Imitation of his Predeceſſors, interpoſes by his Legate *Bernard*, and obliges the King to recall this Act. He was, in ſhort, not only learned, but a great Patron of Learning and learned Men.

[1294.] After a Vacancy of above two Years, *Peter Moroneus*, an Anchorite, is choſen Pope by the Name of *Celeſtine* V. a Man of great Simplicity and Eaſineſs; ſo ready to grant, ſays the Author of his Life, *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 2. *p.* 1364, that rather than fail he would promiſe the ſame Thing to two Perſons. He was, without Queſtion, a great Stranger to the World, and Secular Affairs, or he had not ſo eaſily been deluded by his Succeſſor Cardinal *Cajetan*, who by a nocturnal Stratagem terrified him into an Abdication or voluntary Reſignation. The Editors, in the Life of *Celeſtine* and his Succeſſor *Boniface* VIII. are very tender of this Point. In the Firſt, *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 2. *p.* 1364, they tell us, " That *Celeſtine*, by reaſon of the great " Weight of Affairs, and his own Want of Expe- " rience, finding himſelf unfit for ſo important " an Adminiſtration, determin'd to reſign; which " Reſolution of his Cardinal *Cajetan* ſo encourag'd, " that, notwithſtanding *Charles* King of *Sicily* en- " deavour'd all he could to diſſuade the Pope from " abdicating, he voluntarily quitted the Chair in " the Sixth Month of his Pontificate." In the Life of *Boniface* VIII. they ſay, " He was choſen in the " Room of *Celeſtine*, who reſign'd." *Ib p.* 1397. Thus they varniſh over the moſt concerted Cheat that ever was practis'd with the Sham of Abdication, a good Word too often miſapplied. The Truth is this: Cardinal *Cajetan* (whom the Editors own, *ibid.* to be a Man extreamly arrogant and ambitious) taking the Advantage of poor *Celeſtine*'s

Eaſi-

Easineſs and Simplicity, enters his Apartment by Night, and in a feign'd Voice, pretending from Heaven, adviſes him to reſign: Which he, taking it for a real Viſion, accordingly did; and *Cajetan* is by the Name of

[1294.] *Boniface* VIII. elected in his Room; who is no ſooner poſſeſs'd of the Chair, but, to ſecure his ill-gotten Greatneſs, reſolves to make ſure Work, and prevent his Predeceſſor from reſuming the Papal Dignity, by impriſoning the deluded *Celeſtine*, who thought of nothing more than retiring to his former Solitude, in which Confinement he died of Grief. At the Inauguration of *Boniface* two ſurpriſing Omens happen'd, which plainly foretold the turbulent Genius of the Man. The Firſt was as he paſs'd to his Coronation; when a ſudden Darkneſs, and violent Storm aroſe, that blew out the Lamps and Tapers in the Church. The Second was upon his Return from the Church, when, a Tumult happening among the People, above Forty Men were ſlain. The Ceremony being over, to expoſe the Weakneſs and Fallibility of his two laſt Predeceſſors *Nicolas* and *Celeſtine*, he reſcinds the Indulto's and Favours granted by them. And to ſhew his implacable Hatred to the *Gibelline* and *Columnenſian* Factions, he perſecutes them with the utmoſt Severity; not only diveſting *James* and *Peter*, whom Pope *Celeſtine* had created Cardinals, of the Sacred Purple, but deſpoiling them of all their Wealth and Poſſeſſions, and ſubjecting them to Excommunication. In the Year 1297, in a haughty imperious Manner, he commands *James* King of *Arragon* to invade *Sicily*, and depoſe his Brother *Frideric*; who reſolutely maintaining his Right, and the *Sicilian* Nobility ſupporting him, the good Man curſes them heartily, and puts the Kingdom of *Sicily* under an Interdict: And where-

as

as it was cuſtomary with the Biſhops of *Rome*, for the Offences of Princes, to forbid the Uſe of the Sacraments and other Holy Offices in their Dominions, Pope *Boniface*, *A. D.* 1298, puts out a declaratory Conſtitution, inſtructing both Clergy and Laity how to behave themſeves under an Interdict. This unnatural Act in arbitrarily commanding one Brother to invade another, and curſing and interdicting Subjects for being faithful and obedient to their lawful Soverign, is alone ſufficient to create an Abhorrence in all Men; and yet the Editors, tho' they call this Pope *ſupra Modum ambitioſus & arrogans*, do in the preceding Words to theſe call him, *Rerum Experientia laudabilis, ibid.* 1297.

His haughty Behaviour to crown'd Heads was inſupportable, for he was not content with the Supremacy in Spirituals, but claim'd the Right of diſpoſing of Temporal Kingdoms. This is plain from the Claim he laid to *Scotland*, as appears from his Letter to our King *Edward* I. which he ſent to *Robert* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, obliging him upon Pain of Suſpenſion *ab Officio & Beneficio*, to deliver his Letter to the King, and earneſtly preſs him to acquieſce to his Demands. This Letter indeed, is not written with the uſal Air of Domineering and Threatning; but, after a long Preamble of the Right of his Claim to the Kingdom of *Scotland*, he poſitively declares, *Regnum Scotiæ ad Eccleſiam Romanam pertinere*: *That the Kingdom of* Scotland *belong'd to the Church of* Rome, *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 2. *p.* 1401. King *Edward* I. with great Reſpect and good Manners anſwers the Pope, makes out his Claim, and perſiſts in his Right; and ſo the Editors leave it. But with *Philip the Fair* of *France* he dealt quite otherwiſe; for he demanded feudal Obedience of *Philip*, which he diſdaining to comply with, return'd

turn'd this contumelious Anſwer to his inſolent Demand, *Sciat tua maxima Fatuitas, &c.* a Reply not a little grating to his haughty Holineſs. But for this Pope *Boniface* is not long in his Debt; for the Quarrel between them encreaſing upon *Philip*'s forbidding any of his Subjects going to the Court of *Rome*, or ſending any Money thither, the Pope calls a Council, excommunicates King *Philip*, abſolves his Subjects from their Allegiance to him, and transfers his Kingdom to the Emperor *Albert*. As to the Excommunication of King *Philip*, the Editors cannot agree. In the Life of Pope *Boniface* VIII. they affirm he did excommunicate him. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 2. *p.* 1398. But in the Margin *Coſſart* falls foul on *Binius*, and ſays it is a Miſtake of his, referring to a Note of his own, *ibid. p.* 1477. where, inſtead of charging *Binius* with the Miſtake, he makes it out that this Pope did excommunicate King *Philip*. For he ſays, that there was nothing done againſt *Philip* by Name, but that, as hindering the *Gallican* Biſhops from going to *Rome* to attend at the Council called by Pope *Boniface*, he was involv'd in thoſe Sentences generally pronounc'd againſt thoſe that ſhall hinder Acceſs to the ſupream Pontiff; which of Courſe implies Excommunication. But of this more in the Council of *Paris*, 1303.

This Pope was the firſt that inſtituted the Sacred Year at *Rome* called the Jubilee; at which there was a prodigious Confluence of People, and where, the firſt Day appearing in his Pontifical Habit, he bleſs'd the People; the Second Day he appeared in an Imperial Habit, with a Crown on his Head, and a naked Sword being carried before him, he called out, *Behold the Two Swords*, meaning the Eccleſiaſtick and Temporal. *Chron. Uſpergenſ. poſt Crantzium Continuat. p.* 262. Upon which, ſay the Hiſto-

rians that relate this, as amaz'd at his Arrogance, *Thou ſeeſt, O Peter, thy Succeſſor; and thou, O Saviour Chriſt, behold thy Vicar: See to what Height the Pride of the Servant of thy Servants is arrived!* But it is Time to bring this Monſter to his End. After a Reign of Eight Years and as many Months, certain Cardinals of the *Gibelline* Faction prevaling, and the World growing weary of the Tyrant, a Party of 300 Horſe is diſpatch'd to *Anagnia*, where his Holineſs is detain'd a Priſoner for three Days; but being reſcu'd by the Citizens, he arrived at *Rome*; where thirty Days after he died miſerably. His whole Pontificate was one continued Series of Pride and Tyranny, and his Character ſo vile and black, that none but the Editors in their Account of his Life offer the leſt Shadow of Good in his Favour. Nay *John Stella*, who, in his Commentary on the Lives and Manners of the *Roman* Pontiffs, is wont to flatter the very worſt of Popes and Men, particularly *Alexander* VI. and *Julius* II. calls Pope *Boniface* VIII. crafty, moſt ungrateful, arbitrary, arrogant and wicked. But beſides what others ſay of him, there is nothing ſhews his unbounded Deſire, and inſatiable Thirſt of Power, and promoting the Majeſty of the Pontifical See more than that one Clauſe of his Decretal *de Majorat. & Obedient. Porro ſubeſſe Romano Pontifici omni humanæ Creaturæ declaramus, dicimus, definimus, & pronunciamus omnino eſſe de Neceſſitate Salutis. Extravag. Commun. Lib.* 1. *Tit.*8. *c.* 1. Making Obedience from all Creatures living to the See of *Rome* an Article of Salvation. Certainly there never was a greater Complication of Ambition, Craft, Treachery and Tyranny, in any one Man, than in this Pope; whoſe infamous Life juſtly drew this Proverbial Saying on him in after-Times, *That he crept into the Papacy like a Fox, rul'd like a Lion, and died like a Dog.*

In

In the Seventh Year of Pope *Boniface*'s Pontificate, *viz.* *A. D.* 1300. there were ſeveral Councils held, which ſpeak highly in Favour of the Supremacy, and confirm ſeveral unjuſtifiable Innovations, and former Corruptions in the Church. Particularly the Councils of *Melun*, *Colon*, and *Baieux*. In the Fourth Canon of the Council of *Colon*, Pluralities, ſo much inveigh'd againſt before, are allow'd with the Apoſtolick Diſpenſation; too leading a Precedent for the many uncanonical Abuſes practis'd afterwards in holding Plurality, not only of Parochial, but Cathedral Churches. The Fifth and Sixth Canons are very preſſing to the People to bequeath Legacies to the Church and Poor. Which undoubtedly tend very much to the Promotion of Religion and Charity; but the Seventh Canon, which remits Twenty Days of Pennance injoin'd, to the Perſon that ſhall bequeath any Thing to the Church, makes the Inducement to this Act conditional, and ſavours too much of Popiſh Compact, and Perſonal Merit; for, if Heaven were to be brib'd, Who would not on his Sick Bed give all he has to ſecure Eternal Reſt? Which to encourage the more, the Eighth Canon ſays, That every one may make his Will in Sickneſs, and whatever Propriety he ſhall bequeath, he ſhall enjoy the Uſe of it whilſt he lives. Legacies to the Church and Poor are unqueſtionably great Acts of Devotion; but God only, who can meaſure the Will and Intent of the Donor, is Judge of the Merit; for to remit Pennances for a Pecuniary Mulct, or to proportion them to the Quality of Legacies, ſavours of Secular Intereſt and Avarice.

The Fourth Canon of the Council of *Baieux* is a Renovation of the old Corruption of Baptiſm; which is here allow'd by Lay-Hands, either of Men

Men or Women, in caſe of Neceſſity; of which having ſpoken at large before, I ſhall only add, that leaſt this Innovation ſhould paſs unimprov'd, they have in this Canon tack'd ſome ſuperfluous Unneceſſaries to it, ſuch as the *Pabulum Salis*, the *Aurium Linitio cum Saliva*.

The Eighth Canon of this Council introduces the Elevation of the Hoſt, which is perform'd by the Prieſt in the Celebration of Maſs; and when he comes to the Words, *This is my Body*, then he is decently to elevate it, that it may be ſeen of all preſent. And after the taking of the Euchariſt, they are to forbear Spitting; which if they cannot do, they muſt ſpit in a clean Place, which cannot be trodden upon.

The Ninth Canon ſays, If any Part of the Wine, (which, ſince the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, they call the Blood of Chriſt) fall upon the Altar-Cloth, the Altar-Cloth ſhall be wrap'd up in a clean Cloth, and preſerv'd among the Relicks. And if it ſhould drop or fall upon any other Holy Veſtment, the Part which is ting'd with it ſhall be cut off and burnt, and the Aſhes be preſerv'd in the Holy Repoſitory. Likewiſe if it fall upon any Wood, Stone, or the Ground, the Place ſhall be ſcrap'd, and the Duſt preſerv'd in the Repoſitory. No Wonder, indeed, that they abound ſo in Relicks! A moſt exact Decency ought to be obſerv'd in the Performance of all Holy Offices; but theſe are Niceties even to Ridicule.

In the Year 1302, a Council was held at *Pennafiel* in *Spain*, in which ſeveral ancient Canons were reviv'd relating to Eccleſiaſtick Diſcipline; and amongſt them ſome of Pope *Boniface*'s Conſtitutions; but the 11th and 12th Chapters are the moſt ridiculous Inſtances of Superſtition, that the moſt fabulous Legend ever yet produc'd. The 11th

Chapter constitutes the Feast of St. *Ildephonse*, formerly Archbishop of *Toledo*, upon this Occasion; which we'l relate in the Words of the Canon. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 2. *in Append. p.* 2449. "Because the "Mother of our Lord Jesus, after her Assumption "into Heaven, descended from thence, and corporeally visited the Blessed *Ildephonse*, who had been "Prelate of the Patriarchal Church of *Toledo*, and "endow'd him with many rich Gifts; in Memory "of the special Love of the Mother of God, and "those whom she thus Honours, we constitute and "ordain a Feast to be solemnly celebrated through-"out the whole Province of *Toledo*." I shall not trouble my self or the Reader with any Disquisition about the Blessed Virgin's Assumption to, or Descension from Heaven, or what Presents she brought down with her to bestow upon *Ildephonse*; for which the Editors can produce no Proof, but from their *Pseudo-Evangelia*, and Sham Legends, Authorities too gross for any but such biggoted Capacities to admit, whose easy Credulity deprives them of the Use of their Reason. The 12th Chapter is as gross an Imposition as the former; but for the Blasphemy and Prophaneness exceeds it, and runs thus: "Humane Nature being "so frail thro' its Corruption, that it cannot live "without Sin; next to our Lord, our only Recourse "is to the ever-glorious Virgin, whom we are bound "to regard as the Mother of Mercies; therefore we "appoint, that every Day the Hymn *Salve Regina* be "be sung in all Churches, *&c.*" This is interfering with the great Attribute of Mercy, and making the Virgin *Mary* equal to the Godhead in the Distribution of it; expresly contrary to the Doctrine of Christianity laid down by our Blessed Saviour, his Disciples and Apostles, and the Practice of it in the most primitive and pure Times. God is the Fountain of Mercies, who, thro' his Love to the World,

gave

gave his Only Begotten Son, to the end that all that believe in him ſhould not perish, but have Everlaſting Life. *John* 3. 16. The Bleſſed Saviour of the World invites all that travel and are heavy laden to come to himſelf [not to any other] for Refreſhment. *Mat.* 11. 28. St. *Paul* ſays, 1 *Tim.* 1 15. That it was Jeſus Chriſt which came into the World to ſave Sinners; and St. *John*, *Ep.* 1. *c.* 2. *v.* 1. tells us, Our Advocate with the Father is Jeſus Chriſt the Righteous, who is the Propitiation of our Sins. In ſhort, the Virgin *Mary* is no where mentioned by the Diſciples and Apoſtles in the Goſpels or Epiſtles, nor in any Creed, with any other Mark of Honour than that of being, in the Fleſh, the Mother of our Bleſſed Lord; who alone is our Advocate and Mediator to the Throne of Grace; no Acceſs to the Father of Mercies, but thro' his Interceſſion. How ridiculous and Monſtrous then is this deifying and crowning departed Souls, and profanely inveſting them with the Attributes of God the Father and Son?

The next Year, on the Tenth of *April*, *Philip the Fair* calls a Council, or rather an Eccleſiaſtico-Political Convention; at which he commanded all Barons and Governors of Cities, as well as Prelates and Clergy, to be preſent: In which, to revenge the Inſults offer'd their King by the Pope, they charge him with *Simony*, *Uſury*, *Homicide* and *Hereſy*; unanimouſly decreeing, that he ought to be excommunicated, and depoſed the Papal Dignity. The Editors, in their Account of this Council, relate the Matter partially and imperfectly, abruptly breaking off with the Conſent of the Barons and other Laicks only to this Decree, (tho' all unanimouſly agreed to it) and then proceed to the Letters of the *Gallican* Biſhops, as if they declin'd what the reſt had reſolv'd: Whereas the Letters of the aforeſaid Biſhops are no more than a Remonſtrance to the Pope, whom with the utmoſt

Deference and Regard they intreat to revoke his Edict, wherein he demands Subjection from *Philip* to him, as his Temporal Superior; putting him in Mind of the Allegiance they ow'd to their King, whose Person and Honour, as well as the Liberties and Laws of his Kingdom, they were by Oath bound to maintain; and demonstrating the Hazard of the Peace both of Church and State upon this unhappy Difference between their King and him. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 2. *p.* 1475, 1476. How glorious a Clergy was this Prince and Church bless'd with, whose stedfast Loyalty the subtil Artifices, and open Menaces of the Bishop of *Rome* could not shake or warp! These undue Methods, and unjustifyable Proceedings, made *Philip* look about him, and, to prevent the Bishop of *Rome*'s incroaching in Spirituals in his Dominions, he takes upon him to dispose of all Ecclesiastick Titles in the *Gallican* Church. Thus the private Insinuations, and open Attempts of the *Roman* Pontiff in Temporals, threw the *Gallican* Church out of one Vassalage into another; the Regale snatching that from the Pontificate which properly belong'd to neither.

[1303.] *Nicolas* Bishop of *Ostia*, upon the Death of Pope *Boniface* VIII. assumes the Papal Dignity, under the Name of *Benedict* IX. or, as some will, XI. whom the Editors call Antipope, though *Cabbasutius*, *Eccl. Notit. p.* 497. and in his Chronological Index, carries on the Succession smoothly, without any Schismatical Interruption, calling him, *Vir apprimè doctus & pius.* To correct the Irregularities of his Predecessor, he rescinds several of his Acts, particularly the Excommunication of King *Philip*, whom he absolves. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 2. *p.* 1477. This *Cabbasutius* slightly and falsly glosses over, *p. ibid.* saying, that he only renew'd Peace between *Philip* and the *Franks.* For which he can have no true Ground, for it is plain that *Philip* and his Subjects were at Peace, they all, both

both Eccleſiaſticks and Laicks, unanimouſly conſented to his Decrees againſt Pope *Boniface*, as appears from the Remonſtrance of the *Gallican* Biſhops to him. *Benedict*'s Reign being but ſhort, continuing little more than Eight Months, little can be expected. We ſhall therefore paſs on to his Succeſſor,

[1305.] *Bertrand Gotto*, who upon his Acceſſion to the Pontificate changes his Name to that of *Clement* V. He was a *Frenchman* by Nation, being born in the Province of *Burdeaux*, of which he was by Pope *Boniface* VIII. created Archbiſhop, and from whence he was tranſlated to the See of *Rome*; tho' at the Time of his Election by the Conclave at *Rome* he was reſident at *Burdeaux*. Being elected, he ſummon'd all the Cardinals to *Lyons*; where, in the Preſence of King *Philip*, his Brother, and the Duke of *Brittany*, he was crown'd. He tranſlated the See of *Rome* to *France*, reſiding ſometimes at *Lyons*, ſometimes at *Burdeaux*, but chiefly at *Avignon*, where it continued near Seventy two Years. *Cabbaſutius*, *p.* 497. gives the Reaſon of this Tranſlation; *viz.* That it was upon the Account of the frequent Tumults in *Italy*, but does not ſay upon what Occaſion; which in Reality was from the Biſhops of *Rome* aſſuming to themſelves the Power of diſpoſing of the Imperial Dignity, notwithſtanding the Eſtabliſhment of the Electoral College to the contrary many Years before. And tho' upon the Death of *Albert* of *Auſtria*, *Henry* Duke of *Luxemberg* was elected Emperor, yet this Pope would ſeem to have ſo much Part in the Election, that *Henry* muſt receive the Confirmation of the Election from him; which was upon Condition, that after Two Years he ſhould go to *Rome*, and there take his Crown; his Holineſs having delegated Three Cardinals there to adminiſtrate in his Abſence. *Henry* accordingly preſents himſelf to the Cardinal-Miniſters at *Rome*; but refuſes to take the Oath of Fidelity to

the Pope; which Diſobedience coſt him his Life; for *Bernard*, his Confeſſor, a Dominican Fryar, being ſuborn'd for that Purpoſe, with a poiſon'd Hoſt diſpatch'd him at the Siege of *Florence*, making the Bleſſed Viaticum a Vehicle of Deſtruction. This infamous Action *Cabbaſutius*, *p.* 498. wretchedly endeavours to palliate, by urging the natural Infirmity of Body the Emperor *Henry* at that Time languiſh'd under, producing only Partizan-Authority to the contrary, from the Continuator of *Ptolomy Lucenſis*, *Villanus*, *Florentinus*, and *Albertus Patarinus*, which he ridiculouſly deſtroys, by urging the Deſign of Poiſoning Pope *Victor* II. in the Holy Cup, which was miraculouſly diſcover'd by the Sub Deacon. The Manner of relating this is very inconſiſtent with Reaſon; for, tho' it is poſſible a Subdeacon might be privy to ſuch a Deſign, yet it is very prepoſterous to ſuppoſe he could any Way be concern'd in the Adminiſtration of it; Subdeacons having nothing to do in the Office of Conſecrating or Adminiſtring either Element; and therefore, conſequently, it muſt be a Prieſt that muſt be concern'd in this Fact; or, if the Pope himſelf had conſecrated the Wine, ſtill there is no Room left for a Subdeacon to be concern'd. But, granting the Story to be taken in a Senſe moſt favourable to *Cabbaſutius*'s Intention, it is foreign to the Matter; there being juſt as much Difference in the Caſe between an Emperor poiſon'd, and a Pope deſign'd to be poiſon'd, but eſcap'd; as between a Man murder'd, and one that had eſcap'd Murder. What elſe relates to this Pope, we ſhall take Notice of in the Councils during his Pontificate.

To make the Election of Pope *Clement* V. look plauſible, the Editors have publiſh'd the Decree of his Election, ſign'd by Seventeen Cardinals, in which they call Pope *Benedict*, *Sanctæ Memoriæ Papa*; tho' themſelves, in the Life of him, call him Schiſmatick and

and Antipope. To which they ſubjoin the Cardinal's Letter, to acquaint him with their Election of him. *Con. T.* 11. *par.* 2. *p.* 1497, 1498.

Clement, in the Firſt Year of his Reign, publiſhes a *Manifeſto* in Favour of King *Philip*; wherein he takes off Pope *Boniface* VIII.'s Bull againſt him, by which the King and all his Subjects had been excommunicated. *Ibid. p.* 1499.

In the Fifth Year of his Pontificate he calls a Council at *Presburg* in *Hungary*, in which Cardinal *Gentilis*, his Legate, preſided. There were Nine Canons made at this Synod; the firſt and laſt of which begin with the uſual Claim of Sovereignity over all. The firſt ſays, in the Apoſtolick See Chriſt laid the Foundation of the Catholick Faith; and that it is the Mother and Sovereign of all Chriſtians. *Ibid. Part* 2. *p.* 2454. *in Append.* And the Ninth ſays, That the Apoſtolick See is by a ſingular Privilege propos'd to all as an Object of Obedience. *Ibid.* 2462. And leſt theſe Two Canons, ſo highly declaratory of the Intereſt of the Pontifical Supremacy, ſhould fail of their Force, they both enjoin ſtrict Obedience to them from all Archbiſhops, Biſhops, Abbots, Priors, *&c.* under Pain of moſt ſtrict Cenſure of a Power that will make them ſenſible how dangerous it is to diſobey. And to give them a more formal Sanction, Pope *Clement* V. at *Avignon* confirms them by a particular Inſtrument for that Purpoſe. All this Stir was occaſioned by the Obſtinacy of the Archbiſhops, Biſhops, and other Prelates of *Poland*; where the Sovereign Pontiff's Power had not now prevailed; for the Ninth Canon ſays, and complains, That ſome Biſhops and Chapters in *Poland*, containing all Letters or Orders of the Apoſtolick See, and its Legates, about the receiving of Canons into their Churches, would not proceed therein without the Conſent of their Superior. And therefore to enſlave them to the See of *Rome*, as the Biſhops

thereof had done many other Churches of *Chriſtendom*, this Council of *Presburg* was call'd, which anſwered the End it was intended for.

The Year following a Council was call'd at *Saltzburg*, in which *Conrade* Archbiſhop thereof, and Legate of Pope *Clement*, publiſhes a Conſtitution of his Holineſs in Mitigation of one of Pope *Boniface* VIII. which I mention only becauſe it is written in the ſame Style of Sovereignty as the former, claiming the Paſtoral Care over all Chriſtian Nations by Divine Injunction. *Ibid. p.* 1516. Thus we ſee the unjuſt Pretenſions of the See of *Rome* to univerſal Power, (though never prov'd) by frequent Claims paſs into an irrefragable Cuſtom; and the ſlaviſh Submiſſion of all or moſt Primates in *Europe*, who were either Legates or Creatures of the *Roman* Pontiff, gave him ſo uncontroulable a Power in all Chriſtian Nations, that he could influence the Minds of their Kings to his Advantage upon any Occaſion; witneſs his Letters to the Princes of *Germany*, *France*, *England*, *&c.* for the Extirpation of the Knights-Templars; who were become ſo numerous and powerful in the aforeſaid Countries, and grown ſo exorbitant and irregular, that the good Man at *Rome*, more out of Jealouſy of his own Power (which he found they every where deſpis'd) than any religious Deſign, reſolves the total Subverſion of their Order, leſt others, in Imitation of them, ſhould throw off the Yoke. In order to the Accompliſhment of this Deſign, he attempts, by Provincial Synods in *England* and other Places, to open the Scene; where, by his ſpecial Direction and Command, he obliges each Primate to enquire into the Crimes charged upon the Knights-Templars, exhibiting Articles of Inquiſition againſt them. Theſe Preliminaries being ſettled, and all Things prepared for a general Extinction of the Order in all Parts, Pope *Clement* V. calls a general Council at *Vienna* in *France*,

to

to which he ſummons the Attendance of the King of *France*, and Fifteen more, by their Ambaſſadors. The Letter which he wrote to *Philip* King of *France*, is the very ſame with that to each of the reſt; which begins with the uſual Claim of Supremacy, calling the Church of *Rome* the Mother of the Faithful, and Head and Sovereign of all other Churches; to the Government of which he affirms the Biſhop of *Rome* to be deputed by Chriſt himſelf; and that none can be ſaved but they who practiſe the Doctrine delivered by the *Roman* Pontiff. *Con. T.* 11. *par.* 2. *p.* 1539. So that by this, if a Pope lapſe into Heatheniſm, Hereſy, Idolatry, Blaſphemy, *&c.* (as many have done) they muſt be believed, and their Doctrine (though never ſo oppoſite to divine Precepts) become an Article of Salvation. The reſt of this Letter contains the Charge againſt the Templars, and that very heavy; which, though it can ſtrictly concern but ſome of that Fraternity, yet he extends it to the whole Order, the Subverſion of which in the whole Proceſs he ſeems reſolutely bent upon: Though the natural Intent of all Eccleſiaſtical Synods, either Provincial or Oecumenical, was for Reformation of Irregularities, not for Extinction of Foundations; which is contrary to the Intent of the Inſtitutors or Benefactors. Suppoſing the Charge of Hereſy, Apoſtacy, *&c.* to be true, yet the Offence of a Part ought not to affect the Whole: And granting the Whole to be guilty of the Charge, there was no Neceſſity of extinguiſhing, but rather of reforming; eſpecially conſidering the great Service this Order had done in Defence of the Holy City and Land; which this Letter of Pope *Clement* and the Hiſtory of this Council acknowledge. The latter indeed urge the Diſobedience of the Templars to the Patriarch of *Jeruſalem*, from whom they received their firſt Benefits, as the firſt Article of their Charge. But the Editors ought to have conſidered,

that

that the Biſhop of *Rome* lead the Way in this, by encroaching on the Patriarchate of *Jeruſalem* himſelf, creating Patriarchs there, and making them but his Subſtitutes and Legates, (as we have already noted;) though it is plain from an infallible Text of Holy Scripture, that the Firſt Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, St. *James*, was Preſident of a Council held there, and even in the Preſence of St. *Peter*, pronounced the decretory Sentence, to which the reſt of the Apoſtles agreed. *Act. Apoſt.* 15. And therefore the See of *Rome* had no Pretence to diſpute Precedency with that of *Jeruſalem* in the moſt early Times of Chriſtianity.

But notwithſtanding the high Crimes charged againſt the Templars in the Letters of Pope *Clement* to the ſeveral Kings and Prelates, and in his extinctory Sentence, *Coſſart*, in his Addition to this Council of *Vienna*, *Con. T.* 11. *par.* 2. *p.* 1569. out of an anonymous MS. Author in the *Vatican*, ſeems to give the true Reaſon of this Severity againſt the Templars; "The Firſt Seſſion (ſays he) was for the Affair of "the Templars and their Order, which was grown "very ſcandalous, by reaſon of the diverſe Hereſies "and Errors crept in among them: The Second, "about ſending Aid to the Holy-Land: The Third, "for Reformation of Manners, and the State of the "Church." But, continues the ſame Author, (and which is the Point that gives the true Light into the Affair of the Templars, for the reſt were but diſtant Pretences for calling this Council:) "The Pope, "with ſeveral Prelates and Cardinals, in a private "Conſiſtory, had reſolved upon the Diſſolution of "the Order of the Templars: And the extinctory "Decree was on the 3d Day of *April*, 1312. openly proclaim'd and confirm'd in the Preſence of "King *Philip*, (*cui negotium erat cordi*; *who was mightily pleas'd with the Buſineſs*) his Three Sons, and his "Brother *Charles*." So that this whole Affair ſeems

to

to be carried on againſt the Templars more to gratify the King than out of any particular Regard to their Irregularities; for not only the King of *France*, but other Princes, grew weary of them; none of which had ſo fortunate an Opportunity to extirpate them as *Philip*; for *Clement* V. was a *French*-man; and no Doubt the Tranſlation of the Papal Chair from *Rome* to *Avignon* was upon no ſlight Obligation. But the clancular Conſiſtory, wherein the Pope diſſolv'd the Order of Templars, and the Hint which the aforeſaid anonymous Author gives, of the great Satisfaction the publiſhing of the extinctory Sentence againſt the Templars gave to King *Philip*, plainly point out the Perſon chiefly affected and moſt highly gratified in the Diſſolution and Extirpation of this Order. But this is not the only Inſtance of the Poſſeſſor of St. *Peter*'s Chair being a Tool of State. It's probable the Templars, by their Wealth and Numbers in moſt Parts of the Chriſtian World, might give Umbrage of Jealouſy, not only to the Civil Power, but to the Biſhop of *Rome*; and that many of them might be guilty of the Crimes charged upon them: But their Irregularities cannot juſtify the irregular Proceſſes againſt them; for though ſome were corrupt in their Morals, it cannot be ſuppos'd, that among ſo great a Number of Men, who were diſperſed in all Countries, there were none religious and virtuous among them: Or if they were all involved in this general Corruption of Manners, the Order it ſelf, and the primary Inſtitution of it, were ſtill the ſame; and they might have puniſhed the Delinquents without the Extinction of the Order. But there is ſtill a greater Hardſhip upon the Templars than what hath been mention'd. In all judicial Proceedings, the greateſt Criminal hath an equal Title to Juſtice with the moſt innocent: But in the Caſe of the Templars it was quite otherwiſe; for in the extinctory Sentence or

Decree, Pope *Clement* V. owns, "That they could "not legally, according to the Inquiſition and Pro- "ceſs, pronounce a diſinitive Sentence againſt them; "and therefore, by Way of Proviſion, or Apoſto- "lick Ordination, they pronounc'd Sentence with "an irrefragable and perpetual Sanction, forbidding "any Perſon for the future to enter into the Tem- "plars Order, or take the Habit upon them, under "Pain of *ipſo facto* Excommunication." *Ibid. p.* 1557. Here was the higheſt Injuſtice, without the leſt Pretence of Right; for if there was no Law to condemn them, the whole Proceeding was arbitrary and unjuſt, and his Holineſs, notwithſtanding his Infallibility, very much miſtaken. But this might poſſibly be done with another Deſign; and the Power, which the extinctory Sentence calls *Proviſion*, or *Apoſtolick Ordination*, was by the Supream Pontiff exerted for no other End than to ſhew, That St. *Peter*'s Chair was not to be circumſcrib'd within the ſcanty Bounds of Juſtice; but, Right or Wrong, to extend its Supremacy in all Places, or over all Perſons, and upon any Occaſion.

But how poſitive ſoever the Pope and his Partizans were the next Year in the Council of *Tarragona*, which the Editors wholly omit, upon Enquiry, the Innocence of the Templars appear'd, and they were to be reſtor'd to their Habitations and the Privileges of their Order, only to be in Subjection to the Biſhop of the Place they liv'd in. *Card. d'Aguire, Con. Hiſp. T.* 3. *p.* 549

A. D. 1311. a Council was held at *Ravenna* by *Raynold* Archbiſhop thereof. In the Proeme to which he enjoins a plenary Obſervance of all Conſtitutions, Canons, Decretal Epiſtles of Popes, and Legatine Conſtitutions; and then ſubjoins Thirty two Canons; among which, ſome old Superſtitions of the *Roman* Church are reinforced, and ſeveral ridiculous Superfluities

fluities added. The Third and Fourth enjoin the Anniverſary Solemnities for the Souls of deſunct Biſhops, Patrons, Benefactors of Churches, *&c.* The Eighth, among the ſeveral Utenſils of the Church, mentions the Little Bell, being highly uſeful and neceſſary to ſtir up the Minds of the People to their Devotion, and drive away evil Spirits; which Bells the Canon orders to be bleſs'd according to the Solemnity preſcrib'd in the pontifical ridiculous Superſtition! The Eleventh Canon obliges all the Faithful to remember the Form of Words us'd in Baptiſm, that they may not be unprovided in caſe of Extremity. But of this we have ſpoken before. The Fourteenth, ſpeaking expreſly of the Non-exempts of the Order of St. *Benedict*, plainly implies the Exemption of other Regulars from the Cenſure of this Council, though Provincial: But the Twenty fourth is more plain, for obliging all Clergy to produce a Licence from their proper Dioceſan upon their Admiſſion into Orders from another, it excepts the Order of the Mendicants and other privileged Perſons.

A. D. 1314. another Council was held at *Ravenna*, by the ſame *Raynold*, Archbiſhop, and his Suffragans; wherein ſeveral of the Canons of the Council of *Ravenna*, *A. D.* 1311. are repeated and confirmed. But the Preface being very particular, I ſhall give the Reader a Taſte of the Temper and Inclination of the foreſaid Archbiſhop *Raynold*, who was a Creature of the Pontificate, and its modern Doctrines and Opinions; as appears very plainly from this Paſſage; *Nos Raynoldus, Permiſſione Divinâ, & Apoſtolicæ Sedis Gratiâ, ſanctæ Ravennatis Eccleſiæ Archiepiſcopus, ad Honorem omnipotentis Dei, beatorum Petri & Pauli Apoſtolorum ejus, beati Apollinaris Patroni, ſanctorum Martyrum Vitalis & Urſicini, ac aliorum Martyrum & Confeſſorum, quorum Meritis & Precibus, ne dum ipſa Eccleſia*

Raven-

Ravennas, immo omnes Cathedrales Eccleſiæ, ac aliæ venerabiles de Provincia ſunt fundatæ & dotatæ, &c. Nor is the Dependance of this See on that of *Rome* only mentioned here, but frequently in the Canons of this Council; particularly in the Twelfth Canon, where they allow the Diſpenſation of the Apoſtolick See, in collating Perſons far under Age, as thoſe of Sixteen Years old, to Eccleſiaſtical Benefices that require Prieſts Orders The Fourteenth Canon is the ſame with the Eighth Canon of the former Council of *Ravenna*, about the Obligation on all People to remember the Form of Baptiſm in caſe of Diſtreſs. The Fifteenth is a Confirmation of a moſt ridiculous Superſtition practiſed by the *Romaniſts* in their publick Confeſſion at the Beginning of the Maſs, in theſe Words: "I confeſs to God Almighty, to the Bleſſed Virgin *Mary*, to Bleſſed *Michael* the Archangel, "to Bleſſed *John* Baptiſt, to the Holy Apoſtles *Peter* "and *Paul*, and to all Saints." This Innovation is in it ſelf ſo groſs, that I ſhall not need to aggravate it by any Animadverſion; for certainly our Supplicating the Almighty, through his Bleſſed Son's Interceſſion, is ſufficient without any ſubordinate Aſſiſtance; eſpecially when we are ſo frequently told in Holy Scripture, that we have but one Advocate with the Father, who is Jeſus Chriſt. *Con. Tom.* 11. *par.* 2. *p.* 1604, 1612, 1614, 1615.

[1316.] Pope *Clement* V. dying in the Year 1314, the Holy See was vacant Two Years. *Cabbaſutius* well obſerves, That this Time was remarkable for the Miſeries both of Church and State, occaſioned by the Diſſention of Electors. *Eccl. Not. p.* 498. *col.* 2. Upon the Death of the Emperor, *Henry* of *Luxembergh*, the Electors were divided, ſome being for *Frideric* Duke of *Auſtria*, others for *Lewis* Duke of *Bavaria*; which threw *Germany* into terrible Convulſions. After various Succeſſes on both Sides, the For-

tune

tune of War at beſt declar'd in Favour of *Lewis*, who, upon the Ruine of *Fridaric*, (whom he defeated and took Priſoner) mounted the Imperial Throne, thereby putting an End to a Nine Years *Interregnum*. About the ſame Time, and by the ſame Sort of Diſagreement among the Spiritual Electors, the Apoſtolick See was vacant for Two Years and ſome Months, which, ſays *Cabbaſutius*, *ibid.* was the Occaſion of much Scandal and Offence to the Chriſtian Religion. But this the Infallibility of the Chair wip'd off, by ſupplying the Vacancy with *John* XXII. Which Election, how plauſible ſoever ſome make it, was one of the moſt indirect irregular Proceedings that ever paſſed the Conclave. The Editors indeed are ſilent in the Manner of the Thing; but *Cabbaſutius* is particular; which, in a Caſe ſo diſadvantagious to the Pontificate, is very unexpected. Take it thus from the above-cited Page. " *James Deuſa*, under the Name " of *John* XXII. on the 7th of the Ides of *Auguſt*, " is declared Pope at *Lyons* by the Brothers Preachers, " by whoſe Aſſiſtance *Philip* Count of *Poictou*, ſum- " moning the Cardinals together, under Pretence of " adviſing with them upon ſome Emergency, ſur- " priſes and impriſons them; as had been before con- " certed between *Lewis* X. of *France* and his Bro- " ther *Philip* Count of *Poictou*, on purpoſe to conti- " nue the Apoſtolick Seat at *Avignon*; which could " not be more effectually brought about than " by chooſing a *French*-man, (for ſuch this Pope " *John* XXII. was) whom Count *Philip* obliges them " to chooſe, (notwithſtanding his Promiſe of a free " Diſmiſſion of them) under the Neceſſity of Starving. Accordingly Pope *John* XXII. is declared; who, to appeaſe the Minds of the Cardinals, deſirous of reſtoring the Holy See to *Rome*, ſolemnly ſwears to them, that he would never mount a Horſe or Mule, but in order to go to *Rome*. In the Beginning

ning of his Pontificate he profecutes the Quarrel begun by Pope *Clement* V. againſt *Lewis* of *Bavaria*, whom ſome of the Editors had choſen Emperor, ſetting up *Frideric* Duke of *Auſtria* in Oppoſition to him. But being fruſtrated in this Attempt by the Defeat of *Frideric*, he publickly ſummonſeth *Lewis* to appear before him at *Avignon*, to account for his aſſuming the Title of Emperor without the Conſent of the Pontifical Chair: Which *Lewis* refuſing, and appealing to a Council, he and his Partiſans are excommunicated by the Pope; who obliges the Biſhop of *Prague*, in his Epiſtle to him, *Con. Tom.* 11. *par.* 2. *p.* 1643. every Sunday and Holiday, publickly to declare *Lewis* excommunicate Heretick and Schiſmatick. Nor does he ſtop here; but, *More Romano*, depoſes him, and commands the Electors to chooſe another in his Room. This the late Champion of the Pontificate *Cabbaſutius* defends, *p.* 498. *col.* 2. affirming (though not proving) the Pope's Right of confirming the Emperor; and that *Lewis* was excommunicated for aſſuming the Title of Emperor without the Pope's Leave: And, *p.* 499. *col.* 1. that the Care and Adminiſtration of the Empire, in a Vacancy of Right, belonged to the Apoſtolick See. The *Romans* having in vain ſollicited the Return of his Holineſs, *A. D.* 1327. call in *Lewis*, who enters *Italy*, ſeizeth the Imperial Crown at *Rome*, calls a Council of Cardinals, and cites Pope *John*; who not appearing, is condemn'd as Antichriſt, Satan, Arch-heretick, depos'd, and burnt in Effigie: And to be quit with Pope *John* in all Reſpects, he creates *Peter Corbarius*, a Minorite, Pope, by the Name of *Nicolas* V. All this while Pope *John* keeps cloſe in *Avignon*, where he with Security deſpiſes the Threats and Attempts of *Lewis*; who returning into *Germany*, Pope *John* takes the Advantage, and with the Help of the *Piſans* ſoon ſubdues his Rival; obliging poor Pope

Nicolas to exchange the Papal Chair for a Priſon, and ſoon after, Life for Death.

In the Life of this Pope the Editors are guilty of a great Reflection on the Infallibility of the Supream Biſhop, *Con. T.* 11. *par.* 2. *p.* 1627. for they ſay he held an erroneous Opinion: But then they want not a Turn for this; for they ſay, that *Lactantius* and *Irenæus* led him into it. The Opinion which he held was, *That the Souls of the Bleſſed departed were detain'd in a certain Place till the Day of Judgment, and till then were not admitted to the Beatifick Viſion.* This the Sorboniſts condemn'd; and ſeveral others look'd upon it as an egregious Hereſy: Which when Pope *John* heard, he intended to have interpos'd his Pontifical Authority, and determin'd the Queſtion: But, ſays his Succeſſor *Benedict*, he was prevented by Death. *Ibid.* But to take off ſtill and leſſen the Scandal of this erroneous Opinion, the Editors, *ibid.* tell us, That there was one *Occanus*, a Tributary of the Emperor, who being excommunicated by the Pope for certain Calumnies which he had caſt upon the holy Man, openly declar'd, That theſe were the very Words of the Pope: "I never intended to ſay any "Thing contrary to the Faith; and if I have ſaid "any ſuch Thing, I renounce it." So that here is a fair Retractation of the falſe Doctrine; and his Holineſs is *Rectus in Curia* again. But where's the Infallible Judge all this while! Beſides this, there was a fierce Diſpute between Pope *John* and the *Franciſcans*. Theſe affirmed, That Chriſt and his Apoſtles had nothing of their own Property, but enjoy'd all Things in common; and that not the Power over, but only the Uſe of ſome Things, properly belong'd to them; taxing thoſe with Hereſy that held the contrary Opinion. Good Pope *John*, to whom Money was as dear as his Soul, and who had heap'd up an immenſe Treaſure, as appears from the Editors, *ibid.*

could not digeſt the mortified Doctrines of Poverty and Want of Dominions, which he knew were utterly inconſiſtent with the Papal Dignity, and its vaſt Extent of Power; and therefore calling in the *Dominicans* to his Aſſiſtance, he condemns the foreſaid Doctrines as vain, fooliſh and heretical; affirming that our Bleſſed Lord was crucified with a Crown on his Head, and cloathed with Purple and ſplendid Garments, and that the Uſe and Property of Things could not be ſeparated from the Dominion, excommunicating the *Franciſcans*, and ſacrificing many of them to the Flames for oppoſing him.

During his Pontificate, which laſted 18 Years, there were many Councils held, to reinforce and confirm ſeveral ſuperſtitious Tenets, particularly the Fifth Council of *Ravenna*, *A. D.* 1317. under that faithful Creature of the Court of *Rome*, *Raynold* Archbiſhop of *Ravenna*, for the ſupporting Indulgences; the Firſt Council of *Avignon* for the ſame, *Cap.* 2. and the Council of *Marchena*, *Cap.* 43.

[1334.] *James Furnerius* ſucceeds his Uncle Pope *John* XXII. by the Name of *Benedict* XII. being elected the 20th of *December*, and crown'd the *January* following. At his Entrance on the Pontificate he condemns the *Franciſcans* of Hereſy, for aſſerting the Poverty of Chriſt, *&c.* But the Year after he condemns his Uncle Pope *John*'s Opinion, notwithſtanding his Infallibility, affirming, that tho' he was of the Number of Cardinals at the Time when his Predeceſſor, to whom the Determination of the Queſtion belong'd, propos'd, *That the Souls of the Faithful deceas'd, were not admitted to the Beatifick Viſion till the Reſurrection*; yet now, by Vertue of the Apoſtolick Authority, he is of another Opinion, and declares, *That the Souls of the Faithful are immediately after Death tranſlated to eternal Life and Reſt in Heaven, where they en-*

enjoy the Converſation of the Holy Angels with Chriſt, and inſtantly enjoy the Sight of the Divine Eſſence. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 2. *p.* 1793, 1794.

In the Fourth Year of his Pontificate, he revives the old Quarrel between his Uncie and the Emperor *Lewis*; who, notwithſtanding he earneſtly and often ſu'd for Abſolution, is not only excommunicated, and the former Cenſures againſt him confirm'd, but the Imperial Dignity declar'd vacant, and devolv'd upon him as Vicar of Chriſt. And, to preſerve *Italy* from the Invaſion of a foreign Enemy, he perſuades the Governors of Provinces, and others in Power, to ſhake off the Yoke of Obedience to their Prince, and govern by Vertue of their own Authority. [Tho' the Editors in the Life of this Pope, *ibid. p.* 1793. ſay, he created them Vicars of the Holy See.] And to ſecure himſelf againſt the Emperor, he perſuades the People of *Rome* to reſume the *Senatorian Dignity*, and govern independently of the Emperor: Who being highly incens'd by ſo many Injuries and Indignities, *A. D.* 1338, ſummonſeth a Convention at *Frankfort*; where, by the common Conſent of the Princes and Prelates, he ſets forth an Edict, in which he calls the Pope and his Adherents Phariſees and Antichriſts.

[1342.] *Petrus Rogerius*, another *Frenchman*, under the Name of *Clement* VI. takes Poſſeſſion of St. *Peter*'s Chair; who, in the Beginning of his Papacy, the better to keep in with the *Romans*, impatient of having the Chair reſtored to *Rome*, inſtitutes another Jubilee, to be kept every Fiftieth Year. He ſucceeds his Predeceſſors in their Reſentment againſt the Emperor *Lewis*, whom, notwithſtanding his repeated Inſtances for Reconciliation, he declares Heretick, and excommunicates; from which Sentence he was not to expect Abſolution but upon theſe Terms, *viz.* To de-

liver up *Occamus*, to cancel the Edicts he had made againſt the ſeveral Popes, to acknowledge the Empire to hold of the See of *Rome*, to own himſelf a Heretick, to diveſt himſelf of the Empire, and not to reſume it without the Conſent of the Pope. Which unreaſonable Conditions the Emperor refuſing, he is again, *A. D.* 1346. excommunicated, and the Electors commanded forthwith to chooſe another Emperor, or his Holineſs would impoſe one on them. Theſe impotent Menaces, inſtead of ſtrengthening, did but infeeble the Power of the ſupreme Pontiff; the Decay of which was chiefly owing to theſe Two Cauſes: Firſt, The Tranſlation of the See from *Rome* to *Avignon*; Secondly, The frequent Quarrels between the Emperors and Popes. To which I may ſubjoin a Third, *viz.* The Schiſm that commenc'd upon the Death of *Gregory* XI. who reſtor'd the See to *Rome*. But of this in its Order of Time.

1. As to the Firſt Cauſe of the Decay of the Pontifical Majeſty, it is very plain from the Conſequences: For *Clement* V. who was a Subject of *France*, and advanc'd to the Papal Dignity by the Intereſt of *Philip the Fair*, in Return, remov'd the See to *Avignon*; which gave Birth to Variety of Factions among the *Italians*, who were not a little diſcontented to ſee the Grandeur of *Rome* ſo diminiſh'd, and its Power enervated. But that which ſtill contributed to the Leſſening this Power, was Pope *Clement* V. and his Succeſſors, whilſt the See continued in *France*, becoming Tools and Creatures ſubſervient to the Ends of the *French* Court; a great and undeniable Inſtance of which was the Council of *Vienna*, *A. D.* 1311. call'd on Purpoſe to gratify *Philip the Fair* with the Extirpation of the Order of *Knights Templers*; wherein it's plain he was but the *French* King's Inſtrument; tho' he acted as tyrannically as any Pope before or ſince in that Council; not asking or expecting the Con-

Conſent of the Council, but arbitrarily decreed the Extinction of the Order. 2. The Second Cauſe of the Decay of the Papal Majeſty, was the many and unjuſt Quarrels with the Emperors, and other Princes, who upon every ſlight Occaſion were excommunicated, and their Subjects exhorted, nay, commanded, to reſiſt and depoſe them: Too many Inſtances of which the Hiſtories of moſt Ages furniſh us with. This made the ſeveral Princes fence againſt ſuch unreaſonable Encroachments of the Pontificate upon the Regale; which occaſion'd uneaſy Jealouſies on both Sides, and thoſe often broke out into open Feuds: And then his Holineſs fulminates out his *Anathema's*; which Sentence, though in its ſelf moſt dreadful, yet the frequent Repetition of it made it leſs terrible, eſpecially when this Eccleſiaſtick Monarch exerciſed this Spiritual Cenſure only to ſerve a baſe, ſordid, ſecular End. This created the Pontificate many and powerful Enemies; the moſt formidable and fatal of which to this Time was *Lewis* of *Bavaria*, the Emperor; who having often and in vain ſollicited a Reconciliation with the See of *Rome*, in a general Convention of Princes at *Frankfort*, (where our King *Edward* III. was preſent) declares the Pope to have nothing to do in the Election of the Emperor, *&c.* at the ſame Time drawing the Pens of the moſt Learned Men of the Age in his Quarrel, who ſoon inſtructed Princes how to repel the thundering *Anathema's* of the Court of *Rome*.

The laſt publick Act of Pope *Clement* VI. was his buying the City of *Avignon* of *Joan* Queen of *Naples* and *Sicily*; but whether he thought he had a hard Bargain of her, or what elſe was the Occaſion, I ſhall not pretend to judge, he ſoon after excommunicated Queen *Joan*.

[1352.] *Innocent* VI. before call'd *Stephen*, a *French* man, ſucceeds; who copies after his Prede-

ceſſors in maintaining the uſurp'd Rights of the Pontificate over the Regale: For when the Emperor *Charles* IV. enter'd *Italy*, he would not permit him to be crown'd at *Rome*, but upon theſe Conditions, *viz.* To enter the City on Foot; to take an Oath to leave *Italy* forthwith, and not to return till he was ſent for by the Pope. The cunning Emperor accepts the Conditions, and took the Oath, ſubmitting the Imperial Majeſty to his Holineſs's Ambition: Which procured him a long Reign; for at that Time, and after, he was oppos'd by no leſs than Three Candidates, and who were ſucceſſively choſen; and therefore he was obliged to comply with what Conditions the Pope ſhould impoſe on him, though never ſo unreaſonable; for his Holineſs's Weight on either Side would very advantagiouſly have turn'd the Scale. Though his Reign held Ten Years, yet there is little ſaid of him, or tranſacted by him, but one Council being call'd during his whole Pontificate.

About the Year 1360, which was toward the End of Pope *Innocent* VI.'s Pontificate, the famous *John Wicklef* flouriſhed; a moſt excellent Philoſopher and compleat Divine, and no leſs eminent for his holy Life and moral Virtues, than Learning. He was a ſtrenuous Oppoſer of thoſe ſuperſtitious Errors, which for a long Time, like poiſonous Weeds, had ſprung up in the Church, and ſuppreſs'd the true primitive Doctrines; and an able and valiant Champion in Defence of the Rights of the Church and Crown, againſt the exorbitant Encroachments and Uſurpations of the *Roman* Pontiff and his Mendicant Brethren: For the Pride and Arrogance of the Court of *Rome* was arrived to that Height, that they received at leaſt half the Revenues of the Kingdom: And in Eccleſiaſtick Affairs the Friars Mendicants grew ſo impudent and importunate, that they rambled about the Nation at Pleaſure, intruding into Pariſhes with-

out

out Controul, and paying no Subjection or Acknowledgment to Epiſcopal Juriſdiction and Canons of the Church. Theſe Extravagancies, *Wickleſ*, both from the Pulpit and with his Pen, couragiouſly and ſucceſsfully attacks, delivering the Doctrines of the Chriſtian Faith in their naked and natural Simplicity, and preaching and expounding the Sacred Oracles of the Scripture in the Mother-Tongue. This, as it drew on him the Envy of the Bad, procured him a great Eſteem among the Good; and ſo endear'd him to King *Edward* III. and *Richard* II. that one employ'd him as his Ambaſſador Abroad, and the other choſe him his Confeſſor at home; and his Authority and Intereſt were ſo prevalent with the great Men of the Kingdom, that there were more and ſeverer Laws made againſt the Uſurpations of *Rome*, and the Exorbitances of the Mendicants, in the Reigns of theſe Two Kings, than from the Time of *William* the *Norman* to the throwing off the *Roman* Yoke under *Henry* VIII. The Editors, in the Life of *Innocent* VI. *Con. T.* 11. *par.* 2. *p.* 1230. call him Arch-heretick; and ſay, that being put by the Biſhoprick of *Worceſter*, in Revenge he broach'd his Doctrines; but it plainly appear'd the utmoſt of his Ambition and Endeavours was to ſet the Doctrines of the Church in a true Light, and to extricate the Chriſtian Faith out of that Labyrinth of Errors and Superſtition it had for many Ages been involved in. The ſeveral Biſhops of *Rome* that liv'd during his Time plainly perceiv'd their Cauſe ſinking in *England*, and the Mendicants began to deplore the Diſcovery of their Knavery; wherefore, to ſupport their tottering Intereſt, they begin to beſtir themſelves on all Sides to ſilence and ruine *Wickleſ*. The Firſt Attempt upon him was by the Power of Archbiſhop *Langham*, who in the Year 1367. removed him from the Maſterſhip of *Merton* College, together with the Fellows; who appeal to Pope *Ur-*

ban V. and the Matter being by him left to the Determination of Cardinal *Andruyn*, their Deprivation is by him confirmed, and afterwards ratified by the Pope's Bull *A. D.* 1370. Toward the End of King *Edward* III.'s Reign, (who was now worn out with Age, and become almoſt delirious) *Simon Sudbury*, Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, calls a Synod at *London*, where *Wichlef* is ſummoned to give an Account of his Doctrine; but *John* Duke of *Lancaſter*, and ſeveral of the Nobility, ſtanding faſt to his Intereſt, he came off untouch'd; as he did likewiſe in another Synod at *Lambeth*: But after the Death of King *Edward* III. when the Kingdom began to be diſturb'd, and *John* Duke of *Lancaſter* retired from Court, the Biſhops, by repeated Letters from Pope *Gregory* XI. began to move again; and having gain'd King *Richard* II. (a Prince too apt to be led away) into their Intereſt, in a Synod at *London*, *A. D.* 1382. they condemn'd *Wicklef*, his Doctrine, and Followers; but notwithſtanding this Sentence of the Synod, he remain'd at his Pariſh of *Lutterworth* in *Leiceſterſhire*, where to his dying Hour he continued firm to his Principles, which he maintain'd both by Preaching and Writing.

[1362.] *William Griſant*, another *Frenchman*, by the Name of *Urban* V. ſucceeds; and, in Imitation of his Predeceſſors, to ſhew his Power in Secular Affairs, in the Beginning of his Pontificate, thunders out his *Anathema's*. The Firſt of which fell on Count *Bernabas* of *Milain*; next on *Peter* King of *Caſtile*, whom he not only excommunicates, but (*More Romano*) commands to be expell'd his Kingdom; and, to add to the Infamy of theſe Proceedings, orders his natural Brother *Henry* to be legitimated, and put in *Peter's* Room. Soon after, upon a very ſlight Occaſion, he quarrels with *Peter* King of *Arragon*, whom he excommunicates, and deprives of the Kingdoms of *Corſica* and *Sardinia*. *A. D.* 1367. he goes to *Rome*, where,

where, having ſettled Affairs according to his Mind, he triumphs in Security. *A. D.* 1378. he received the Emperor *Charles* at *Rome*, having firſt made him (to ſhew his Humility) perform the Office of Groom of the Stirrop. The Year following he dignifies *John Paleologus* Emperor of *Conſtantinople* with the ſame Office, having firſt invited him to *Rome*, in Hopes of gaining Aſſiſtance againſt the *Turks*; whom, after he had ſworn Obedience to him, he diſmiſs'd. The ſame Year he return'd to *Avignon*, where in *December* he quitted this World, to receive in the next the Reward of his Charity, Meekneſs and Humility, to crown'd Heads.

In the Eighth Year of *Urban* V. a Council was held at *La Vaur*, by the Biſhops of the Three Provinces of *Narbonne*, *Toulouſe*, and *Aquitain*, but by the Special Direction of the Pope; as appears from his Epiſtles to *Peter* Biſhop of *Narbonne*, *Con. T.* 11. *par.* 2. *p.* 1957, 1958. where, among the 133 Canons, near half are but old ones reviv'd, and in them ſeveral groſs ſuperſtitious Errors; particularly in the firſt, which is very long, and contains an Expoſition of the Doctrine of Faith, according to the Apoſtolick, Nicene, and Athanaſian Creeds. In the Expoſition of the Seven Sacraments, *viz.* Baptiſm, Confirmation, the Euchariſt, Pennance, Extream Unction, Orders, and Marriage, they ſay on the Article of Baptiſm, *The Prieſt in this Sacrament is the Miniſter, or any other in caſe of Neceſſity.* Ibid. p. 198. Inſiſting on the old Error of Lay Baptiſm, which we have already noted in the Fourth Council of *Carthage*, in the Time of Pope *Anaſtaſius* I. *A. D.* 398. In the Expoſition on the Ten Commandments, they obſerve the ſame Method, in leaving out the Second, and dividing the Tenth into Two, to ſupply the Number; as was begun by Pope *Hadrian* I. *ad An.* 772. *& ſeq.*

[1370.] Car-

[1370.] Cardinal *Belfort*, by the Name of *Gregory* XI. ſucceeds Pope *Urban* V. of whom there is little ſaid by the Editors, or any other Author. The Firſt remarkable Act was his Excommunicating *Joan* Queen of *Naples*; whom, notwithſtanding this was not the firſt Time ſhe had lain under the heavy Cenſure of the Supream Pontiff, *Cabbaſutius* defends, and mentions with Compaſſion, *Eccleſ. Notit. p.* 500. *A. D.* 1376. he iſſues out a moſt thundering *Anathema* againſt the *Florentines*; who treat his Holineſs with the utmoſt Contempt, compelling the Clergy, upon Pain of Death, to perform Divine Service. But the moſt remarkable Paſſage of his Life was the Year following, when he reſtor'd the Holy See from *Avignon* to *Rome*. The Occaſion of this is variouſly related by ſeveral Authors; but the Editors in this Pope's Life take *Platina*'s Account before others, which indeed looks moſt plauſible, and is thus: "A certain "Biſhop being reprov'd by the Pope for Non-reſi- "dence, readily and briskly replied, And why do "you, who are the Head of the Univerſal Church, "and of all Biſhops, abſent from your own Church? "His Holineſs ſtung with ſo juſt a Reproach, imme- "diately prepares to return. *Con. T.* 11. *par.* 2. "*p.* 2306, 2307.

[1378.] From the Time of the Tranſlation of the Pontifical See from *Rome* to *Avignon*, there had ſate Seven Popes in it, *viz. Clement* V. *John* XXII. *Benedict* XII. *Clement* VI. *Innocent* VI. and *Gregory* IX. who reſtor'd it to *Rome*, *A. D.* 1377. where the Year after he died. Upon whoſe Death follow'd a dreadful Schiſm, which continued Fifty Years. The Editors and *Cabbaſutius* differ very widely about the Election of Pope *Gregory* IX.'s Succeſſor. They, *Con. Tom.* XI. *par.* 2. *p.* 2044. ſay, That *Bartholomew* of *Naples*, and Archbiſhop of *Veria*, was by the common Conſent of the Cardinals living at *Rome*, without any

Compulſion or Fear of the *Roman* People, choſen Pope, who afterwards took upon him the Name of *Urban* VI. *Cabbaſutius* ſays quite the contrary, who tells us, *Eccleſ. Notit. p.* 500. *col.* 1. "That when the "Cardinals were enter'd the Conclave, to conſider "on the Choice of a new Pope, the People of *Rome* "being jealous, that upon the Choice of a *French*-"man the Pontifical See would be again remov'd "from *Rome*, forcibly enter'd the Conclave, threat-"ning the Cardinals with Death if they did "not forthwith chooſe an *Italian* Pope. In this "Fright they choſe *Bartholomew* Archbiſhop of *Ve-*"*ria*, who was very buſy among the regionary Go-"vernors, and had inſinuated himſelf among the "Mob at that Time." They likewiſe differ in the Occaſion and commencing of the Schiſm; for the Editors ſay, *ibid.* That Pope *Urban* VI. in the Begin-ning of his Pontificate, taking upon him to correct the Looſeneſs of Morals among the Cardinals, they not ſubmitting to his Correction, he withdraws from *Rome* to *Anagnania*; and whilſt he was abſent, they choſe another Pope in his Room. But this does not carry a Face of Truth with it; and *Cabbaſutius*, *ibid.* ſeems to have more Truth, or, at leaſt, Plauſibility, on his Side; for he ſays, "*Joan* Queen of *Naples* had "ſhewn her ſelf very kind to Pope *Urban* in the Be-"ginning of his Pontificate, furniſhing him with "Money, Guards, Proviſions, *&c.* who (good Man) "in Return, conſpires with her Uncle *Charles* Prince "of *Dyrrachium* to deprive her of her Kingdom: "Whereupon ſhe quits the faithleſs ungrateful Man, "and ſides with the Schiſm againſt him." But be it how it will, it's moſt certain that the Cardinals in the *French* Intereſt were the major Part of the Conclave, and therefore, retiring from *Rome*, they met at *Fondi*, where they choſe *Robert* Count of *Gebenne* Pope; a Man, (ſays *Cabbaſutius*) eminent for his proper Me-

rits,

rits, as well as illuſtrious for the Greatneſs of his Extraction, and crown'd him with the Pontifical Crown, which they brought from *Rome*, he taking upon him the Name of *Clement* VII. Which was the real Occaſion of the Schiſm, and of thoſe terrible Convulſions which ſhook great Part of *Europe* for many Years. Theſe Two Chiefs prepare with both Spiritual and Temporal Arms to attack each other, drawing ſeveral Nations into their Intereſt, Pope *Urban* ſets up the See at *Rome*, *Italy*, *Germany*, and *Hungary*, declaring for him; whilſt *France*, *Spain*, and the reſt of the Weſtern Church, acknowledge *Clement* at *Avignon*. Pope *Urban*, in Imitation of his Predeceſſors, to be reveng'd of *Joan* Queen of *Naples* for ſiding with the Sciſmaticks againſt him, calls in *Charles* Prince of *Dyrrachium* to dethrone her, which he accompliſhes by the Help of the good Pope, who was not wanting in ſupplying the Prince with Men and Money, and poor Queen *Joan* (to uſe *Cabbaſute*'s own Words, *ibid. p.* 500. *col.* 2.) ABDICATES, and her Nephew *Charles* plac'd in her Room. Pope *Urban* having thus ſucceſsfully reveng'd himſelf of Queen *Joan*, and obliged Prince *Charles*, makes no Scruple of gaining any Point; and therefore he demands of him to create his Nephew Prince of *Capua*. But notwithſtanding all former Obligations, Prince *Charles* proves juſt ſuch another Ingrate as his Holineſs, and refuſes his Demand; upon which Diſappointment he retires to *Nuceria*, where in a very ſolemn Manner he depoſes Prince *Charles*; who briskly returns his Compliment, and beſieges his Holineſs, who is relieved by Count *Raymund*: And returning from *Nuceria*, through *Genoa*, he executes Seven Cardinals that conſpired againſt him. Upon the Death of *Charles*, he intended to go to *Naples*, to deprive his Children of the Kingdom, but Death prevented him. His whole Life was, in ſhort, one continued Series of Trouble, being

being ſeveral Times taken Priſoner, and always expos'd to Danger.

In the Beginning of this Schiſm there was a Council called at *Complutum*, (now called *Alcala de Henaras*) by the Biſhops of *Spain*, wherein *Peter Tenorius*, Archbiſhop of *Toledo*, preſided. At which Time, *Urban* poſſeſſing the See at *Rome*, and *Clement* at *Avignon*, and both claiming the Title of true and lawful Succeſſor of St. *Peter*, it was debated by the Fathers of this Council, whom they ſhould declare for; but they came to no Reſolution. This was *A. D.* 1379. In which Year, and upon the ſame Occaſion, there was a Convention of Biſhops at *d'Illeſcas*, and another at *Toledo*, where the ſame Archbiſhop preſided. Likewiſe another at *Burgos*, and the Year following another at *Medina Campeſtris*; in all which nothing was determin'd about the Queſtion in Hand; and though Legates from both were employ'd to urge them to a Reſolution, whom they would own, they warily decreed to refer the Matter to the Determination of a General Council. But in the Year 1381, a Council was held at *Salamanca*, where *Peter de Luna*, Cardinal-Legate of *Clement* VII. preſided, in which *Urban* is rejected, and *Clement* acknowledg'd for Pope. The ſame Thing was done, *A. D.* 1387. in a Convention of the Biſhops and Nobility of *Navar*, and in another at *Barcelona*; by which Means *Clement* carried his Point throughout *Spain*. This Council of *Complutum* is not mentioned by the Editors, but is to be ſeen at large in Cardinal *d'Aguirr*'s *Conc. Hiſpan. Tom.* 3. *p.* 618, 619, 620.

[1389.] Upon the Death of *Urban* VI. *Boniface* IX. before called *Peter Thomacell*, is elected and conſecrated Biſhop of *Rome*. In the Thirty fourth, or, as ſome ſay, in the Forty fifth Year of his Age. In the firſt Year of his Pontificate he took off the Anathema which his Predeceſſor *Urban* had laid on *Charles* King

King of *Sicily* and his Posterity. The Editors, *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 2. *p.* 2077, quarrel with *Theodoricus a Niem*, and say, That he unjustly charges the Sovereign Pontiff with Simony and Avarice; and that they give two of the greatest Instances of his insatiable Thirst of Wealth: For in his Second Year he lays that heavy Burden of First-Fruits on the Church, obliging every one to pay the Value of the first Year's Profits of all Ecclesiastick Benefits into the Apostolick Treasury. In the Year 1394, the *Romans* were fatally sensible of the Power his Holiness had gain'd by this Tax; for having quieted the tumultuous Seditions between the Nobility and Populace, (of which he cannot escape being thought the Fomenter) he fortifies the Castle of St. *Angelo*, stores it with warlike Ammunition, disposes of the Magistracy, and levies Taxes at Pleasure; insomuch that *Bzovius*, *ad An.* 1394. *n.* 1. says, *He was the first of all the* Roman *Pontiffs that took all Power from the People of* Rome, *and invested the Sovereignty of the City in himself.* But how favourably soever the Editors may speak of Pope *Boniface*, yet at the End of his Life, they say, he was too indulgent to his Relations, for which he deserv'd a little Reprehension.

[1394.] The Editors and *Cabbasute* leave out *Benedict* XIII. by which they make a Vacancy of above Ten Years; for *Boniface* IX. dying *A. D.* 1394, and *Innocent* VII. not being chosen till *A. D.* 1404, there must of Course be such a Vacancy; or else they must admit of *Benedict* XIII. which it's plain they do not. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 2. *p.* 2083. and yet they say nothing of a Vacancy before *Innocent* VII. was elected; only that he was chosen in the Reign of *Robert* the Emperor, upon Condition that, to put an End to the Schism, he should at any Time resign the Papacy. For, continue the Editors, *ibid.* all the Cardinals before the Election, in the Presence of

Go-

Gobeline and *Theodoric*, had ſolemnly oblig'd themſelves by Oath, Whoſoever of them ſhould be choſen Pope, if need required, to reſtore the Unity of the Church, he ſhould reſign, provided that *Peter de Luna*, who called himſelf *Benedict* XIII. would do the ſame. "*Innocent* ſtands to his Word, ſay they, and accor-" dingly called a General Council at *Rome*; but the " *Gibelline* Faction prevailing there, none of the Bi-" ſhops ſummon'd could with Safety appear. For " *Innocent* having, ſoon after his Election, reſtor'd the " Government of the City to the Senate, they grew " ſo inſolent as to demand all Fortifications, *&c.* re-" lating thereto, to be delivered to them; and cal-" ling in *Ladiſlaus* King of *Naples*, they took up " Arms. But *Ladiſlaus* being defeated by *Urſinus*, " *Innocent* comes to *Rome* again, from whence he had " upon the foreſaid Tumults retir'd, where he ſoon " after dy'd." The Attempts that were made by ſome for healing the Schiſm, ſeem very ſincere, eſpecially thoſe of *Innocent* VII. but thoſe of *Gregory* XII. his Succeſſor, and *Benedict* XIII. prov'd very unfair and ſhuffling; for they ſeldom ſtood to any Thing they propoſed. This *Benedict* XIII. was that very *Peter de Luna*, whom we have had Occaſion to mention a little before, being a Creature of *Clement* VII. and, as Cardinal Legate from him, preſided in the Council of *Salamanca*, *A. D.* 1381, wherein *Urban* VI. was rejected, and *Clement* VII. acknowledg'd Pope; upon whoſe Death he was choſen Pope at *Avignon*, and with great Cunning and Obſtinacy held the Pontificate till the Year 1423. He was conſecrated and crown'd conditionally, taking an Oath to reſign, if *Boniface* IX. would do the ſame, to put an End to the Schiſm. Amongſt all the Princes that propoſed the Reſtauration of the Peace and Unity of the Church, by putting an End to this unhappy Schiſm, none were ſo forward in promoting it as *Charles* VI. King of *France*,

France, notwithſtanding the Papal See was held at *Avignon*. In order to this, in the Year 1394, by his own Authority, he calls a Council of Archbiſhops and Biſhops at *Paris*, at which were preſent ſeveral of the King's Counſellors, and the Chancellor of *France*; and *Simon Cramandi*, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and Adminiſtrator of the Church of *Carcaſſone*, was by a general Conſent choſen Preſident. Beſides the Patriarchs, Archbiſhops, Biſhops, Abbots, Deans, *&c.* there were ſummon'd the moſt learned Profeſſors of Theology and the Laws, to adviſe with about a Reconciliation; where every one upon Oath obliges himſelf freely to offer what he ſhall think moſt expedient, to procure an Union. Of the Three Methods propoſed, *viz.* by a General Council, by Compromiſe or Award, and by Ceſſion, the laſt ſeem'd the moſt plauſible; to which the Fathers unanimouſly agree, and then deliberate upon the Manner of obtaining this Ceſſion from either Party. Upon the ſame Account there was another Council called at *Paris* the next Year; but in the Year 1398, there was a Third Council called there; in which it was unanimouſly reſolv'd, That *Ceſſion* was the only Remedy; and the *Subtractory Decree* was publiſh'd, by which *Benedict* was to be depriv'd of all Money, Subſidy, Proviſions, Benefices, and all Sort of Emolument, till he conſented to the Ceſſion propoſed. *Spondan. Annal. ad An.* 1398. *n.* 5, 6, *& ſeq.* After this, to the Year 1398, he was importunately ſollicited by many Chriſtian Princes and Biſhops, to reſtore Peace to the Church; but all in vain, for he is continually inventing ſome Subterfuge or Evaſion to elude them, that he might preſerve the Pontificate to himſelf. But at laſt *Charles* VI. being tired with his inſincere Dealing, reſolves to compel him by Force; and therefore beſieges him in *Avignon*, takes him Priſoner, and continues him in Cuſtody till the Year 1403, when the

cunning Fox makes his Eſcape, and flies to his old Arts of diſſembling, declaring he was always ready to reſign, to put an End to this flagrant Schiſm, tho' he left no Arts unattempted to maintain himſelf in the Papacy.

[1406.] Nor was his Competitor *Gregory* XII. before called *Angelus Coriarius*, behind-hand with him in the ſame Methods; and tho' both, in their Epiſtles to each other, ſeem ready to ſacrifice themſelves for the Peace of the Church. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 2. *p.* 2085, *& ſeq.* yet it's plain from their Practices, they never intended any ſuch Thing. In ſhort, the two *Good Men* never mean what they ſay; but uſe all the Artifice imaginable to cheat each other, and impoſe upon the World: Which ſoon open'd the Eyes of all, eſpecially the Cardinals on both Sides, who were reſolv'd to be trick'd no longer, and therefore called a General Council at *Piſa*. The Editors in the Life of Pope *Gregory* XII. own a Council was called at *Piſa*, and that the two contending Pontiffs were by it depoſed, but they do not ſay it was called by the Conclave or College of Cardinals; and tho' it is own'd to be called by them, even by *Cabbaſutius* himſelf, (as we ſhall preſently ſhew) yet in the Title of it the Editors will not own it, but ſay, *The General* Piſan *Council, called to put an End to the Schiſm, by depoſing the contending Popes* Gregory *and* Benedict, *and held under* Alexander V. *choſen by the Conſent of the Cardinals of each Party. Con. T.* 11. *ib.* 2114. Now theſe two Popes being under the Cenſure of each oppoſite Party, are by them called to account for keeping up a Schiſm, and to be put off no longer by Promiſes, they, tho' theſe Popes were at that Time both undepoſed, by Vertue of their own Authority call a Council, and that a General one too. Where then is the mighty Topick ſo much boaſted of, and inſiſted on by the Friends of the Pontificate, *That none but the*

Biſhop of Rome *can call a General Council*; or that other, *That the Biſhop of* Rome *is above the Cenſure of a Council?* I ſhall not need to deſcant further on theſe Points, the Facts prove themſelves; which nothing more illuſtrates than the Acts of this *Piſan* Council, and further Accounts which *Cabbaſutius* and others nakedly and plainly relate from them. Nay, though both *Gregory* and *Benedict*, in Anſwer to their Summons to appear at this Council, tell the Cardinals, That they had no Right to call a Council, that being their Province only, yet they take no Notice of it, but proceed againſt them both, conſtituting *Guido de Maleſico*, Cardinal Biſhop of *Preneſte*, Preſident of the Council, who as ſuch ſubſcrib'd firſt. *Con. T.* 11. *Par.* 2. *p.* 2213. tho' for ſome Part of the Time of this Council, which was in the 20th Seſſion, Pope *Alexander* V. preſided. But however irregular Pope *Gregory* or *Benedict* might think the Calling it, and Proceedings in this Council, it's certain they had the Pontifical Approbation and Sanction; for the Editors, *ibid. p.* 2321, in the Life of Pope *Alexander* V. tell us, *Omnia quæ in Concilio Piſano decreta erant, ſibi juſta videri dixit. He ſaid, all Things that were determin'd in the* Piſan *Council ſeem'd juſt to him.* And in this Pope's Praiſe, no Body is ſo extravagant as *Cabbaſutius*, *p.* 521. tho' the Editors ſay enough of him; ſo that they muſt not complain of hard Uſage or Encroachment on the Pontifical Rights, when they receive their Sanction from a ſupream Pontiff. But the Council of *Piſa* being called chiefly to put an End to the Schiſm, it will not be improper to give a ſummary Account of it. This Council was called by the Cardinals of both Parties on the 25th of *March*, 1409. to put an End to the Schiſm. At which, beſides the Ambaſſadors of ſeveral Kings and Sovereign Princes, there were preſent 180 Archbiſhops and Biſhops, 300 Abbots, 120 Profeſſors of Divinity, 300 Doctors of Laws.

Laws. In the firſt Seſſion, after the Formalities of opening a Council were over, two Cardinal Deacons, two Archbiſhops, two Biſhops, with ſeveral Doctors and Notaries, by the Command of the Council, went to the Doors of the Church, where making Proclamation, they demand whither *Peter de Luna* and *Angelus de Coriario*, called *Benedict* and *Gregory*, were there preſent, or any Body for them; and none appearing, they were recorded guilty of Contumacy. The Third Seſſion the Decree of Contumacy was publiſh'd againſt the contending Popes for not obeying a lawful Summons; and the Cardinals that adher'd to their Intereſt are ſummon'd to the Council. The Tenth, Eleventh, and Twelfth Seſſions, the Articles againſt the Competitors were publickly read, and prov'd by ſufficient Witneſſes, and declar'd by the Synod, to be manifeſtly plain. The Fifteenth Seſſion the definitive Sentence was publickly read, approv'd, and ſubſcrib'd by the Council; by Vertue of which *Peter de Luna*, and *Angelus de Coriario*, as guilty of *Schiſm, Hereſy, Perjury, and Contumacy, are canonically depoſed, and cut off from the Church, and all the Faithful are abſolved from all Manner of Obedience to them, and all Cenſures and Sentences publiſh'd by either of them for the Space of a Year before are declared void.* The Ninteenth Seſſion the Cardinals proceed to the Election of a new Pope, entring the Conclave the 15th of *June*, to which likewiſe were admitted thoſe Cardinals who were created by the contending Popes during the Schiſm, by a peculiar Indulgence granted by the Synod on this Occaſion; accordingly on the 26th of *June* they choſe

[1409.] *Peter* of *Candia*, Cardinal Archbiſhop of *Milan*, who, upon his being proclaimed Pope, took upon him the Name of *Alexander* V. The Twentieth Seſſion, which was on the firſt of *July*, Pope *Alexander* V. preſides in the Council; confirms all the

Proceedings and Decrees of the Cardinals from the 3d of *May* 1408, unites the two Factions of the Cardinals, grants ſeveral Privileges to thoſe that were preſent at the Council, and began a general Reformation, which he ſoon drop'd, his Pontificate not continuing a Year. The Twenty firſt, ſecond and third Seſſions, all Proceſſes from the Time of the Schiſm are aboliſh'd, Cenſures reſcinded, Promotions, Conſecrations and Ordinations regularly perform'd, ratified; all that adher'd to *Peter de Luna* and *Angelus de Coriario*, lately condemn'd of Schiſm and Hereſy, to be judg'd as Favourers of Hereſy: That within three Years a General Council be held, and that in the mean time Provincial Councils be aſſembled in order to carry on the Buſineſs of Reformation.

Upon the Election of Pope *Alexander* V. Pope *Benedict* XIII. retires into *Catalonia*, and Pope *Gregory* XII. to *Rimini*; where they both create Cardinals, and in Council condemn each his Rival and their Followers, and reſcind all their Acts. *Bellarmine*, in his firſt Book, *de Concil. &. Eccleſ. c.* 8. did ill conſider the Supremacy of the Pontificate, (of which he is ſo ſtrenuous a Champion) where he ſays, *Ferme communem eſſe Opinionem, Alexandrum* V. *& qui ei ſucceſſit, Joannem* XXIII. *fuiſſe veros Pontifices: Et ex tribus qui tum ſe pro Pontificibus gerebant, iſtos maximè ut veros Pontifices cultos. It was the received* Opinion, *that* Alexander V. *and* John XXIII. *who ſucceeded him, were true Popes; and that of the Three who claimed the Papacy, they were acknowledg'd as ſuch. Richer. l.* 2. *c.* 6. *p.* 71. For it is undeniably plain from all their own Authorities, that *Alexander* V. was choſen Pope by the *Piſan* Council, which was called by the Cardinals, without the Conſent of either of the contending Popes: Which plainly determines againſt a Pope's being above the Cenſure of a Council.

[1410.] Pope *Alexander* V. being removed out of the Way by Poiſon, makes Way for his hopeful Succeſſor, *John* XXIII. a Complication of all Manner of Villany: Who, partly by Bribes, partly by Force of Arms, terrifies the Majority of the Conclave to declare him Pope, which they accordingly do. He enters upon the Pontificate like many of his Predeceſſors, thundring out his Anathema's againſt ſeveral, particularly *Ladiſlaus* King of *Naples*. But in a ſhort Time his Enormities grow ſo conſpicuous, and he ſo odious, that *Sigiſmund* the Emperor inſiſting on that Decree of the *Piſan* Council, which obliges the Biſhops of the Church to hold a General Council once in three Years; Pope *John*, at his Inſtance, is forc'd to call a General Council to be held at *Conſtance*, and promiſe, that he would reſign the Pontificate, if *Benedict* and *Gregory* the Antipopes would do the ſame. Accordingly, in *November*, *A. D.* 1414. he arriv'd at *Conſtance*, and began the Council, at which were preſent, beſides Archbiſhops, Biſhops, Abbots, Doctors of Divinity and of Laws, the Emperor *Sigiſmund*, who was very zealous for the Peace of the Church, and ſeveral Princes of *Germany* and *Hungary*. Tne Council being met, after the uſual Formalities of opening it, the Fathers begin with the State of the Church, now involv'd in a triple Schiſm, there being no leſs than Three who claim'd the Papal Chair. To extinguiſh therefore this monſtrous and flagrant Diviſion, they began with Pope *John*, whom they ply with ſuch preſſing Importunities, that at laſt he reads the Form of Reſignation in moſt ſolemn Manner, kneeling towards the Altar, and with his Right Hand on his Breaſt, (ſays *Cabbaſutius*, *p.* 523. *col.* 1.) he ſware to reſign the Pontificate, provided *Benedict* and *Gregory* would do the like. But notwithſtanding theſe ſolemn Profeſſions, it's plain he intended not to perform them; for being conſcious of

what he deserv'd, and apprehensive of approaching Judgment, he privately and in Disguise by Night withdraws from *Constance* to *Schaffusia*, a Town belonging to *Frideric* Duke of *Austria*, with whom before he had concerted his Escape. The News of this surprizes the Fathers, whom the Emperor comforts, and encourages to proceed, and assures them of his Protection. This was the Proceeding of the First and Second Sessions. And here it will be of Use to observe the Disposition of Affairs in this Council, as *Cabbasutius* and *Caranza* represent them; not to mention *Binius*, *Longus a Coriolano*, and other Parasites of the Court of *Rome*, and Friends of the Pontificate The Fourth and Fifth Sessions of this Council plainly and positively disallow the supreme Power of the Bishop of *Rome*, by subjecting him to the Censure of a General Council. *Con. T.* 12. *p.* 19, 22. decreeing, "That the Council duly called, and representing the "Catholick Church, has its immediate Power from "Christ, which all Persons, even the Papal Dignity, "are bound to obey in Things pertaining to Faith, "the Extirpation of the present Schism, and the Re"formation of the Church both in Head and Mem"bers: Decreeing moreover, that the present Pope "*John* XXIII. shall resign the Papacy, and stand to "the Determination of the Council; that his Retreat "from the Council is unlawful; and, unless he will "return, they will proceed against him as a Here"tick and Schismatick; At the same Time making "void all Acts perform'd by him without the Con"sent of the Council, *&c.* That these were the Acts of this Council, *Caranza*, *p.* 826, 827. and *Cabbasutius*, *p.* 526. *col.* 2. allow; which both would seem to take off, drawing their Argument from Cardinal *Turrecremata*, *Sanders*, and others. "In these "Circumstances (aforesaid), *viz.* of Schism, *&c.* "says *Cabbasutius*, *ibid.* the Decree of the Council of

"*Con-*

" *Conſtance* was right; for all Divines and Cano-
" niſts unanimouſly agree, that a Pope is ſubject to,
" and ought to obey the Authority of a General
" Council, in theſe two Events: 1. When a Pope
" ſhall prove a manifeſt obſtinate Heretick; For he
" ceaſes to be Pope when he is without the Church,
" and conſequently ceaſes to be either Head or Mem-
" ber of the Myſtical Body. 2. When there are
" more Popes than one created; ſo that it cannot
" be known which is the true one, and which the
" falſe; which to be receiv'd, and which to be re-
" jected; as it happen'd in this Diſpute about Three
" Popes. For then it highly concern'd the Govern-
" ment of the Church, and the Salvation of Souls,
" to have a certain Pope, and to put an End to this
" dangerous Schiſm. And this was the true Caſe of
" the Two General Councils of *Piſa* and *Conſtance*.
I grant this to be the Caſe of theſe Two Councils, but cannot allow the Inference that they make from it, *viz.* That the Power of a Council is not abſolutely definitive, but caſually, as in Time of Schiſm; for this Proof is grounded upon nothing but Forgeries. *Cabbaſutius*, *p.* 527. ſays, " That the Holy Biſhop and
" Martyr *Boniface* affirms, no Mortal can call a Pope
" to Account, becauſe he, who has Power to judge
" all Men, can be judged of none, unleſs he be
" proved a Heretick." And this, he ſays, was de-
" termin'd in ancient Councils, particularly thoſe of *Sinueſſa* and *Rome* under Pope *Symmachus*. As for the Council of *Sinueſſa*, it is a moſt palpable Forge-ry, as has been already ſhewn in the Papacy of *Marcellinus*, *A. D.* 296. And as to the *Roman* Council under Pope *Symmachus*, it is the moſt unlucky Cita-tion that could be ſtumbled on. For *Symmachus* was ſo far from being exempted from, not only Eccleſia-ſtick but Civil Judgment, that the Caſe between him and *Laurence* the Antipope was referr'd to *Theoderick*

King of the *Goths*, who declared in Favour of him that had the moſt Votes, and was firſt conſecrated. The ſame likewiſe, *A. D.* 502, was again refer'd to *Theodoric*, who deputing *Peter Altinas* to determine it, it was given againſt *Symmachus*, and he was diſpoſ. ſeſs'd, but afterwards reſtored. *Vid. Supra, ad An.* 498. But *Cabbaſutius* goes on with his forg'd Authority, *ibid.* "No General Council, ſays he, can be regularly "called, without the Authority of the ſupreme Pon- "tiff, as Pope *Marcellus* I. affirms in his Epiſtle to "the Biſhops of the Province of *Antioch*, and Pope "*Julius* I. in his Epiſtle to the Oriental Biſhops; "which *Athanaſius* mentions in his *Apologet.* 2. where- "in he blames them for holding a Council at *An-* "*tioch* without his Conſent. Theſe Two are as no- torious Forgeries as the former: For as to Pope *Mar- cellus*, it is much to be queſtioned whether there ever was ſuch a Man in Being; and as to the Epiſtle to the Biſhops of *Antioch*, *Bellarmine* himſelf will not af- firm it for genuine. *Vid. ſupra, ad An.* 304. But as to the Epiſtle of Pope *Julius* I. to the Eaſtern Biſhops in Behalf of *Athanaſius*, *Cabbaſutius* did ill conſult Antiquity to produce Authority from ſo ſcandalous a Fiction to ſupport the Supremacy; for this Sham- Epiſtle is quite different from the genuine Epiſtle of *Julius*, which is to be found in *Athanaſius*'s *Apologet.* 2. Beſides, *Baronius* condemns it for a Forgery. *Vid. ſu- pra, ad An.* 336. But to take off this Cramp of Power which theſe two Seſſions of the Council of *Conſtance* ſeem to have upon the Papal Supremacy, *Cabbaſutius*, *p.* 526. *col.* 2. tells us, that Pope *Mar- tin* V. before the Diſſolution of the Council, being ask'd about the Confirmation of its Decrees, reply'd, "That he would inviolably keep and obſerve all the "Decrees of the Council which were determin'd, "by Way of Council, in Matters of Faith, and no "other Way. From whence *Cabbaſutius* obſerves, "that

" that Pope *Martin* would not allow of the Decree " of Seſſion IV. of the Council of *Conſtance*, becauſe " it gave them a Power above the Pope, and ſub- " jected him to Puniſhment." But he muſt here miſtake Pope *Martin*'s Meaning, for tho' the Pope ſays, he will confirm no Decrees in Matters of Faith, but what were determin'd in a Synodical Way; yet he does not diſallow any other Decrees of that Council; for the Fourth and Fifth Seſſions of this Council, which he ſtrikes at, were in Favour of him that was to ſucceed Pope *John* XXIII. which prov'd to be himſelf; for the ſame Power that remov'd Pope *John*, and renounc'd *Benedict* and *Gregory*, made him Pope, which was in Seſſion XLI. And as to his trifling Aſſertion, *That a General Council cannot regularly be called without the Authority of the* Roman *Pontiff*; I would fain know, Who but the Cardinals of the two contending Popes, *Benedict* and *Gregory*, called the General Council of *Piſa*, that depoſed both, and choſe *Alexander* V.? But this the ſubſequent Seſſions of this Council more fully explain; and at which this very Pope *Martin* V. in the Quality of Cardinal Deacon, was preſent.

Seſſ. XII. *May* 29. Pope *John* XXIII. having been often ſummon'd to the Council, and offer'd ſafe Conduct, but not obeying, is declar'd guilty of Contumacy, that his withdrawing from the Council was ſcandalous, and diſturbing the Peace and Unity of the Church, fomenting the Schiſm, and contrary to the Promiſe and Oath which he had made to the Church and this Council: That he the ſaid *John* was a notorious Simoniac, and an Embezeller, not only of the Goods and Rights of the Church of *Rome*, but of ſeveral other Churches and Holy Places: That he was an unfaithful Adminiſtrator and Steward of the Affairs Spiritual and Temporal of the Church: That he had notoriouſly ſcandaliz'd the People of Chriſt by his wicked

wicked Life and deteſtable Morals, both before and after his Promotion to the Papal Dignity, even to this very Time. And by his obſtinate and arrogant perſevering in his foreſaid Crimes, and other Things laid to his Charge, *We declare him, as unworthy, uſeleſs and pernicious, to be deprived of all Spiritual and Temporal Adminiſtration, and to be depoſed, and abſolve all Chriſtians whatſoever from all Manner of Obedience, Fidelity, and Oath to him, &c.* To which definitive Sentence was added, That, for the future, none of the contending Popes ſhould ever hereafter be choſen again into the Pontifical Chair. All which was ratified by Pope *John* himſelf, and the Decree being confirm'd, he reſign'd the Pontificate. *Con. T.* 12. *p.* 95, 96, 97. He was afterwards committed to the Cuſtody of *Lewis* Duke of *Bavaria*, by whom he was impriſon'd three Years at *Heidelberg*; from whence being enlarg'd, he died at *Florence*, *A. D.* 1418. This was one great Step towards putting an End to the Schiſm, which is immediately ſucceeded by another; for in the Fourteenth Seſſion *Gregory* XII. finding himſelf deſerted and deſpiſed, conſtitutes *Charles Malateſta*, Prince of *Ariminum*, where he reſided, his Proctor, who in *Gregory*'s Name reſigns the Pontificate; upon which the Cardinals created by him were received and acknowledg'd by the Synod, and both Intereſts united. *Con. T.* 12. *p.* 103. *& in Append.* In the Sixteenth Seſſion, to put an End to the Schiſm on all Sides, the Synod appoint Legates to *Benedict* XIII. to perſuade him to a Seſſion, but in vain; the old Fox trifles with them, and puts them off with nothing but Delays: Which ſo exaſperates *Ferdinand* King of *Arragon*, and other Princes, that they deſert his Intereſt, and forbid their Subjects to acknowledge him any longer as Pope. *Benedict*, no Way diſheartned with theſe Misfortunes, obſtinately perſiſts in his Claim, affirming himſelf to be the only lawful Pontiff of the

Uni-

Univerſal Church, and that he was reſolv'd to maintain his Right and Dignity to the laſt; and retiring with what Friends he could engage, he fortifies himſelf in *Peniſcola* on the Coaſt of *Valencia*, where he excommunicates all Kings and Princes that had receded from their Obedience to him, and depoſes them of their Titles, *Cabbaſut. p.* 525. *col.* 1. *Con. T.* 12. *p.* 1812. where in the Year 1423 he died. But before this, in the Thirty ſeventh Seſſion of this Council of *Conſtance*, the Fathers finding him inflexible, proceed to a definitive Sentence againſt, and as a perjur'd Perſon, Scandalizer of the Univerſal Church, a Favourer and Cheriſher of Schiſm, a Diſturber of the Peace and Unity of the Church, Schiſmatick, Heretick, *&c.* unworthy of all Title, Honour or Degree, they deprive him of the Papal Dignity, *&c. Con. T.* 12. *p.* 235.

The Fathers of this Council having in the ſubſequent Seſſions, after the Depoſition of the foreſaid Popes, reſolv'd upon calling a General Council Five Years after the Diſſolution of this, another after Seven Years, and after that one every Ten Years, and having prepar'd a Form or Profeſſion of Faith to be made by the Pope before his Election be declar'd, and likewiſe about Reformation as well in the Head as Members of the Church, and the Election of a Pope, the Cardinals, and Legates of Five Nations being admitted on this Occaſion, enter the Conclave, and on the Feaſt of St. *Martin* choſe Cardinal *Odo* Biſhop of *Rome*; who, from the Saint of the Day, calls himſelf *Martin* V. *A.D.* 1417. This was in the Forty firſt Seſſion.

In the Forty fourth Seſſion, by the Conſent of the Fathers, he appoints the next General Council to be held at *Pavia* in *Italy*; and in the Forty fifth and laſt Seſſion he grants a plenary Indulgence to all that

that had been preſent at this Council, and ſo diſmiſſes them.

As to the Caſe of Reformation, this Council was very warm, eſpecially in the Buſineſs of Hereſy, as they call it; in which they are ſo tranſported with Fury, that poor *John Wickliff*, dead Thirty Years before, cannot eſcape them; whoſe Doctrine in the Eighth Seſſion they declare heretical, erroneous, and ſcandalous, forbid the Uſe of his Books, anathematizes him tho' dead, as dying impenitent, and condemn his Bones to be digg'd up and ſcatter'd. With like Moderation they treat *John Huſs*, whom, notwithſtanding their Promiſe of ſafe Conduct, unheard and unconvicted, they commit firſt to Priſon, and exhibiting Thirty Articles againſt him, declare him a Heretick, condemn him to be degraded, and his Writings and his Perſon to be burnt, very much againſt the Inclination of the Emperor *Sigiſmund*. *Jerome* of *Prague* being mov'd at the Barbarity of this Sentence, publickly ſhews his Diſlike of it, for which, as a Follower of *Wickliff* and *Huſs*, he is accus'd of Hereſy; but at that Time being ſhock'd at the Apprehenſion of the Sentence, he ſubmits himſelf and his Opinions to the Council, writing a Retractation with his own Hand, which he in Perſon pronounc'd, and deliver'd to the Council. But afterwards reflecting on himſelf, and with Horror deteſting his ABJURATION, with great Prudence and Judgment, and no leſs Reſolution and Preſence of Mind, he preaches up *Huſs*'s Doctrine, bravely defending it againſt all Oppoſers, till the *good Fathers* of this Council, Seſſion XXI. anſwer'd him with the old Argument of Fire and Faggot, and ſtop'd his Breath; decreeing againſt all Favourers and Followers of him.

In the Thirteenth Seſſion, contrary to the very Inſtitution of Chriſt, and Practice of the Primitive Church, (which they themſelves in expreſs Words own)

own) they forbid every Prieſt, upon Pain of Excommunication, to adminiſter the Bleſſed Euchariſt in both Kinds. *Licet Chriſtus ſuis Diſcipulis adminiſtraverit ſub utraq; Specie Panis & Vini, &c. Con. T.* 12. *p.* 100. *Et in Margine: Hoc tamen non obſtante, Sacrorum Canonum Auctoritas laudabilis, & approbata Conſuetudo Eccleſiæ, ſervavit & ſervat, &c.* "Tho' our Saviour Chriſt inſtituted the Sacrament otherwiſe, by "adminiſtring it to his Diſciples in both Kinds, yet "notwithſtanding all this, the laudable Authority of "the Canons, and the known Cuſtom of the Church, "this Cuſtom is introduc'd." That is in plain *Engliſh*, the corrupt Practices of a Council by Tract of Time and Increaſe of Wickedneſs paſs into a Law, are above the Power of the Bleſſed Inſtitutor of the Holy Sacrament, and are a more authentick Standard than his Holy Word. For what elſe can their *hoc non obſtante* mean, but to correct the Author and Finiſher of our Faith, and pretend to mend his Holy Inſtitution. This I take to be a natural Inference, tho' the Editors, in the Citation aforeſaid, are pleaſed to give no other Reaſon for it than this, *viz. That the Body and Blood of Chriſt are as truly contained in the Bread as in the Wine.* If this were granted, (tho' after their own Way, ſince their Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation) Why then cannot the Clergy receive the Body and Blood in One Element as well as in Two? This is conjuring Work indeed, and like extracting Two different Species from One ſimple Principle.

Benedict XIII. dying *A. D.* 1423, one *Ægidius* is created Pope in his Room; but by the Help of *Alphonſus* King of *Arragon*, *Ægidius*, who called himſelf *Clement* VIII. was perſuaded to reſign, and ſo there was an End put to a dreadful Schiſm, which had for One and fifty Years thrown the Chriſtian World into dangerous Convulſions.

And

And here it is worth while to obſerve what a Legacy Pope *Benedict* XIII. left behind him, and that was his Bull of Excommunication againſt all ſuch, either Emperors, Kings, Archbiſhops, Biſhops, *&c.* as had withdrawn their Obedience from him; which was to remain unrevers'd, upon them and their Abettors, till abſolv'd by him the ſaid Pontiff. *Con. T.* 12. *p.* 1812. *& ſeq.* and if they did not ſpeedily return to their Obedience, they were to be depriv'd of their Dignities, whether Eccleſiaſtical or Civil, and all Subjects, Vaſſals, *&c.* diſcharged from paying any Fealty or Allegiance to them.

A. D. 1420, a Council was held at *Saltzburg*, the Metropolis of *Bavaria*, by *Everhard*, Archbiſhop, and Legate of Pope *Martin* V. The Firſt Canon of which obliges all to believe, profeſs, and teach as the Holy *Roman* Church does. And the Year following another Council was held at *Prague* in *Bohemia*, by *Conrad* Archbiſhop thereof, and the reſt of the Clergy, commonly called *Huſſites*, who were for Reformation, to take off the Scandal of Hereſy, which they unjuſtly labour'd under, ſolemnly decreeing for the due Uſe of the Holy Scripture, the Creeds uſed in the Primitive Church, the juſt Adminiſtration of the Bleſſed Euchariſt, and Reformation of Manners. This Council the Editors make no Mention of, but *Cochlæus*, in his *Hiſt. Huſſit. l.* 5. and *Dubravius*, in his *Hiſt. Bohem. l.* 25. make particular Mention of it.

About this Time there were ſeveral Councils held in order to ſuppreſs the *Bohemian* Hereſies, as they call them; the chief of which was at *Colon:* Where, amongſt other Canons, the Tenth is a Confirmation of what had formerly been decreed in Favour of Image-Worſhip and Invocation of the Bleſſed Virgin *Mary*, with this Addition, as the Reaſon of it. *Every Morning and Evening the great Bell of every Church ſhall toll three Times, in Memory of the Compaſſion of the Bleſſed*

Bleſſed Virgin Mary, *to put the Faithful of Chriſt in Mind, that they ſhould worſhip her with an Angelick Salutation, that ſhe, whom her Son denies nothing, and always honours, may intercede to him for us.* And in the next Canon, to give the more authentick Face to it, they inſtitute an annual Feaſt to the Memory of the foreſaid Compaſſion of the Bleſſed Virgin; granting an Indulgence of Forty Days from all Pennances enjoin'd on them who ſhall devoutly obſerve this Feaſt. *Con. T.* 12. *p.* 364, 365.

A. D. 1423, according to the Decree of the Council of *Conſtance*, a Council met at *Pavia* in *May*: But by reaſon of the Plague, which rag'd there very much, was tranſlated thence to *Seyn*, and began there in *November*, Four Legates of the Pontifical See preſiding. In which they declare ſeverely againſt *John Huſs*'s Hereſy, (as they call it) againſt *Benedict* XIII. and his Schiſmatical Succeſſors; but when they began to deliberate about the Reformation of the Eccleſiaſtick State, Pope *Martin* V. well knowing that they aim'd at him, takes Occaſion, from the ſeveral Wars then breaking out among the Chriſtian Princes, to diſſolve the Synod, and appoints a General Council to be held Seven Years after at the City of *Baſil*. Which is accordingly done, and on the 23d of *July*, *A. D.* 1431, the Fathers met in Council, over which, by the Conſent of *Martin* V. (who died before the Council met) and his Succeſſor Pope *Eugene* IV. *Julian* Cardinal of St. *Angelo* is choſen Legate and Preſident, the Emperor *Sigiſmund* protecting them.

[1431.] *Gabriel Condelmer*, a *Venetian* by Birth, ſucceeds Pope *Martin* V. under the Name of *Eugene* IV. a Man of ſo turbulent a Nature, ſays *Stella*, *Vit. Pontif. Baſil*, 1507. that in the Beginning of his Pontificate he put both Church and State into the greateſt Diſorder; and forcing the People of *Rome* to take Arms, they turn upon him, and oblige him to

make his Escape, which he did in Disguise, they pursuing him with the utmost Fury. Pope *Eugene* flies to *Florence*, and the *Romans*, taking the Advantage of his Absence, attempt the Recovery of their ancient Liberties, which Pope *Boniface* IX. had depriv'd them of, removing the Pontifical Magistrates, and putting in People of their own. During Pope *Eugene*'s Stay at *Florence*, the General Council of *Basil* begins, where the above-mentioned *Julian*, Cardinal of St. *Angelo*, presides as his Legate.

The Three chief Causes for which this Council was held were, 1. For preserving the Purity of the Faith. 2. For reconciling the Christian Princes. 3. For reforming the Church both in Head and Members.

1. As to the Business of Faith, Legates are order'd to the *Bohemians*, to invite them to the Council, offering them safe Conduct; which they receiving from the Council and the Emperor *Sigismund*, send their Deputies to *Basil*; who being kindly received by the Council, demand Four Things; 1. That the Eucharist might be administred in both Kinds throughout *Bohemia* and *Moravia*. 2. That all mortal Sins, especially publick ones, might be restrained by those who had proper Cognisance of them. 3. That the Word of God might be faithfully and freely preached by the Priesthood. 4. That the Clergy should be oblig'd to forbear all Temporal Dominion. These Postulatums granted, they were ready to return to the Church of *Rome*, and continue in Unity with her. About these Demands there were many Debates in private Assemblies, but nothing was resolved in Council, except that in the Thirtieth Session, *Decemb.* 23. 1437. it was decreed, *That the Eucharist should be administred but in one Kind to the Laity, that Christ was entirely in either Kind, and that the Custom of the Church should be esteem'd as a Law.* Besides several Particu-

lars, these Two great Points were carried in the Thirty third Session, First: *The Power of a General Council above a Pope.* Secondly, *That a Council could not be dissolv'd or translated to any other Place without the Consent of Two Parts.* Which Decrees whoever oppos'd was declar'd an Heretick.

II. As to the Business of Peace, the Council sent Legates to the differing Princes, by whose Mediation the King of *France* and the Duke of *Burgundy* are reconcil'd; and they might probably have succeeded among other Princes, had not the Differences between the Council and Pope *Eugene* about the supreme Authority frustrated the good Work, and very much retarded the Business of Reformation.

III. As to the Case of Reformation both in the Head and Members of the Church, there were many wholesome Constitutions made, particularly for the Recovery of the ancient Discipline against all Papal Usurpations, and frivolous Appeals. These were the Preliminary Principles attempted by the Council for a Reformation, and which had proceeded further, but for the Dispute about Authority, which the Council on their Side, and the Pope on his, strenuously assert: As will appear by the several Sessions.

Sess. II. The Decree of the Council of *Constance, That a General Council is above the Pope,* was read and confirm'd. *Con. T.* 12. *p.* 477.

Sess. III, IV. *That the Council of* Basil *represented the whole Church, and that the Pope had no Power to dissolve the Council without the Consent of Two Parts; and further resolv'd, That he should neither call any Cardinals from the Council, or create new ones, except in Council. Ibid. p.* 479, 482.

Sess. VI, VII, VIII. A. D. 1432. *The Unity of the Church, and of a General Council,* is delared. *And that no Body, under Pain of Excommunication, should go to* Bononia, *or any other Place, to be present at a Coun-*

cil: That if the See of Rome *ſhould be vacant during the Council's Sitting, the Pope ſhould be choſen in Council: That unleſs Pope* Eugene *recal his Bull for diſſolving this Council, a Proceſs be iſſued againſt him, and that he have nothing to do with the Benefices of thoſe who ſhall adhere to the Council. Ibid. p.* 493, 496, 497. Pope *Eugene* takes this ſo heinouſly, that he recals his Legate, and commands that the Council be tranſlated to *Bononia*.

Seſſ. X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV. *A. D.* 1433. Pope *Eugene* is cited to appear in Council, or, for not obeying, be accus'd of Contumacy, *ibid. p.* 502, *&c.* and further, if he did not recal his Bull of Diſſolution, and within Ninty Days appear in Council, that they would depoſe him. *Ib. p.* 523. At this monitory Prorogation the Emperor *Sigiſmund* was preſent, which not a little frighted his Holineſs; for it is moſt certain, that it was in Complaiſance to the Emperor, whoſe Power he dreaded, and whom he knew to be very deſirous of a Reformation, that he ſuffer'd this General Council of *Baſil* to meet. And therefore ſeeing that the Council had in their Ninth Seſſion, *ibid. p.* 500, received *Sigiſmund* amongſt them, and having before his Eyes the Example of ſome of his Predeceſſors not long before depoſed by the Council of *Conſtance*, he is forc'd to drop his Reſentment, and ſtoop to the Council.

Seſſ. XIV. *ad* XIX. *A. D.* 1433, 1434. *ibid. p.* 523. Pope *Eugene*, to ſhew the Infallibility is ſometimes erroneous, begs Pardon for his Letters written in Prejudice and Derogation of the Sacred General Council of *Baſil*; declaring, that whatever he had attempted or done in Prejudice or Derogation of the ſaid Sacred Council, or againſt its Authority, to be actually void and null; allowing the ſaid Council to be legally continued from the Time of its Beginning, (tho' his Holineſs for reaſonable Cauſes had diſſolv'd it) and that they were to continue to proſecute what they met about,

about, as if there had been no Diſſolution; and in Confirmation hereof, *A. D.* 1433, he publiſhes Three Bulls, *ibid. p.* 529, 531, 532. all which were publickly read and confirm'd in the Sixteenth Seſſion. To purſue this Thread of Story, we muſt paſs to

Seſſ. XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX. *A. D.* 1437. This Year ſeveral Things occur'd which happen'd very commodiouſly for Pope *Eugene*: But none contributed ſo much to his Advantage as the Death of the Emperor *Sigiſmund*, the true Friend and Patron of this Council, and a great and ſincere Promoter of Reformation. The Emperor being dead, and the *Greeks* at the ſame Time coming into the Weſt to propagate an Union with the *Latins*, Pope *Eugene* lays hold of the Opportunity; for, all Apprehenſion of Dread being remov'd, he flies to his old Artifices, and whilſt they are debating where the Meeting for the Union between the *Greeks* and *Latins* ſhould be, he calls a Council at *Ferraria*, diſſolving that of *Braſil* firſt. This Relapſe of Pope *Eugene*'s was unexpected, after ſuch ſolemn Renunciations of former Acts; however they loſe no Time, but fall to work with him.

A. D. 1437. They iſſue out a monitory Citation, wherein they charge him with all Manner of Irregularities and Breach of Canons, particularly Simony, Perjury, Schiſm; and cite him within Sixty Days to appear in Perſon or by Deputies before the Council of *Baſil* to defend himſelf. They likewiſe declare null and void all Nomination, Creation, or Promotion of Cardinals to be made by Pope *Eugene* IV. and upon his not appearing, pronounce him guilty of Contumacy. *Con. T.* 11. *p.* 581, *& ſeq.*

Seſſ. XXXIV. 25 *June*, *A. D.* 1439. In the former Seſſion Pope *Eugene* having been declared guilty of Contempt, and ſuſpended from all Juriſdiction, he is, as a Diſturber of the Peace of the Church, Simo-

niac, Sacrilegious, Perjur'd, Schismatick, Heretick, *&c.* depriv'd of the Papal Dignity, and all Administration of the *Roman* Pontificate. *Ibid. p.* 620.

Sess. XL. 26 *Febr. A. D.* 1440. The Fathers of the Council of *Basil* having declar'd null and schismatical all the Acts of the Councils of *Ferraria* and *Florence*, proceed to the Election of a new Pope, and choose *Amadeus* Duke of *Savoy*, *A. D.* 1440, whom they oblige by Oath to defend and maintain the Rights of the Church and General Councils, to extirpate Heresy, to encourage Reformation, and to observe the Decrees of the Two General Councils of *Constance* and *Basil*; they at the same Time declaring him, *as only true and undoubted Pastor of the* Roman *Church, to be obey'd by all the Faithful of Christ, as they expected Salvation.*

Amadeus, now Pope *Felix* V. in the last Session of this Council, takes his Place as President, and appoints a Council to be held at *Lyons* within Three Years; in the mean Time not dissolving the Council of *Basil*, but allowing it either to be continued at *Basil*, or removed to the City of *Lasonne*.

But now it is necessary to return to Pope *Eugene*, who, notwithstanding the Severity of the Fathers of *Basil*, is not idle, or sparing of his Fulminations against them; but, *A. D.* 1438, begins the Council of *Ferraria*, to which several Prelates of the *Greek* Church, in Hopes of Aid, repaired: But the Plague raging there, it was immediately translated to *Florence*. Pope *Eugene* presided in it, and, besides *Latin* Prelates, there were present at it *John Paleologus*, Emperor of the *Greeks*, *Demetrius Despota*, *Joseph* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, the Proxies of several Eastern Patriarchs, Metropolitans, Abbots, *&c.* After very warm Disputes between the Eastern and Western Fathers, both Sides agreed; tho' it was in a great Measure coercive on the Eastern Prelates Part: For the Emperor

or *Paleologus* coming into *Italy* to ſollicite Aid againſt the *Turks*, who had driven him to Extremities, did not trouble his Head about Matters of Faith, or the Rights of his own Church, the more to oblige the *Latin*, compels the *Greek* Fathers to recede from their own Authority and comply: And notwithſtanding *Mark* of *Epheſus* and ſeveral other *Greek* Fathers, ſtill tenacious of the ancient Faith, proteſted againſt ſuch Proceedings, by common Suffrage it is determin'd, 1. *That there is a Purgatory.* 2. *That the Pope is the Head of the Church.* 3. *That the Holy Ghoſt proceeds from the Father and the Son.* 4. *That unleaven'd Bread may be uſed in the Euchariſt.* This, as it was on the one Side urg'd by Force, ſo was it aſſented to by the other not without much Reluctance, moſt of the *Greeks* with Sighs and Tears giving their Aſſent. Upon theſe Conceſſions the Council was diſſolv'd, the perfidious Emperor ſent back with empty Promiſes, and the poor Biſhops return Home loaden with Grief and Scandal. I am the ſhorter on this Council, becauſe there is ſomething more ſtill to be ſaid of the Council of *Baſil*; tho' it will be neceſſary to take in the Council of *Bourges* by the Way, by reaſon of the PRAGMATICK SANCTION made there, and which was taken *verbatim* out of the Two General Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil* in Defence of the Church, *&c.* againſt all Papal Uſurpations. This Council of *Bourges*, the Editors, *Con. T.* 12. *p.* 1429, will put in the Time of *Eugene* IV. and *Charles* VII. King of *France*, tho' the very Council it ſelf rejects the Council of *Ferraria*, in which Pope *Eugene* perſonally preſided, and approves and owns the Council of *Baſil* which depoſed *Eugene*. And in this Caſe no Author is more entertaining than that honeſt and learned Sorboniſt *Richerius*, who moſt ingeniouſly and ſucceſsfully engages the Champions of the Pontificate, and worſts them by turning their

own Arguments upon them. *Richer. Hiſt. General. Conc. l. 3. c. 7. p. 187, & ſeq.*

The PRAGMATICK SANCTION being, as is already ſaid, taken *verbatim* from the Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil*, was enacted to prevent the Encroachments and Uſurpations of the Biſhops of *Rome* over the Rights of the Church; of which no Part was more jealous than the *Gallican* Fathers, who always diſputed the Rights of the *Gallican* Church in Oppoſition to that of *Rome*. This *Pragmatick Sanction* therefore, as taken from thoſe two Councils, muſt of Courſe have the Ratification of ſeveral Popes; particularly Pope *Eugene* IV. who confirm'd all the Acts of the Council of *Baſil*, *A. D.* 1434, as has already been noted; tho' he ſcandalouſly renounc'd all he had done upon the Death of the Emperor *Sigiſmund*.

But that we may take the Nature and Senſe of *Pragmatick Sanctions* right, it will be neceſſary to obſerve upon what Foundation they ſtand. Firſt then, we muſt conſider, that the Edicts of Kings and Princes, which have obtained the Name of *Pragmatick Sanctions*, are thoſe, *in which the Prince, with the Advice of the Wiſe and Learned, replies to the Requeſt, Remonſtrance, or Suggeſtion of the Judges, or any other Perſons.* Secondly, *That to every Man born either to Civil or Eccleſiaſtick Communion, the Care of his Neighbour is committed by God.* Purſuant to this, Eccleſiaſticks have the Right of Spiritual Direction and Correction over Chriſtian Princes; who, on their Part, bear the Sword to oblige their Subjects to a due Obſervation of the Laws Divine, Natural, and Canonical. Not that they had Power to aſſume Dominion in Spirituals; for this *Conſtantine the Great* diſclaimed, who would uſually ſay to the Biſhops, *Vos intra, Ego extra Eccleſiam, Epiſcopus a Deo ſum conſtitutus: You are Biſhops within the Church, and without the Church I am a Biſhop appointed by God. Euſeb. l. 4. cap. 24. Vit. Conſtantini.* And *ibid. l. 1. cap. 37.*

he is called *Communis Episcopus, the common and œcumenical Bishop in his Empire*; the Word *Episcopus*, or Bishop, being not confin'd to a Spiritual Sense only, as the learned Bishop *Beveridge* observes in his Annotation on the First Apostolick Canon. And after *Constantine* several Emperors, as *Theodosius, Martian, Justinian, &c.* were truly Nursing Fathers and Bishops of the Church *extra*, supporting her Rights, guarding her from the Encroachments of Sacrilegious Invaders, and enforcing her Discipline against heretical Poison and Errors. In Imitation of these and others, *Lewis* IX. of *France*, commonly called the Saint, publish'd a *Pragmatick Sanction*. The Piety of his Design appears in the Front of it, being desirous, for the Good of his People, to restore the ancient Rights and Discipline of the Church, and to promote the Worship of God; both which at that Time were sunk very low in *France*. This *Sanction* of *Lewis* IX. consists of Six Articles: The First, Second, Fourth and Sixth, are for the preserving of the Rights and Jurisdictions of the Church, Patrons presenting to Benefices, Elections, Promotions to Dignities to be canonically observ'd, all Liberties, Franchises, Immunities, Prerogatives, and Privileges formerly granted, to be confirm'd and maintain'd. The Third to extirpate Simony. The Fifth, against all Exactions, *&c.* of the Court of *Rome*. Nothing is more conspicuous throughout this Sanction than an Air of true and sincere Devotion, no Affectation of Dominion in Spirituals, no Assumption of Power over the Church, but in Defence of it, creating a Law by his Civil Authority to enforce the Execution of the Canon. *Richer. Hist. Con. Gen. l.* 3. *c.* 7. There are several Copies of this *Pragmatick Sanction*, of which some are genuine; but that of *Margarinus Bignius*, in his *Bibliothec. SS. Patrum*, leaves out the Fifth Article, which forbids the Exactions of the Court of *Rome*, for this Reason, says

Richerius, ibid. p. 190. *That it might go down the better at* Rome, and escape any Note or Censure. But whatever *Margar. Bignius* may mean by this, its certain that King *Lewis* IX. intended no such Compliment to the Court of *Rome*, but rather to free the *Gallican* Church and Nation from the Usurpations and Encroachments of the Ecclesiastick Monarch; which, as the Fifth Article expresses, *had miserably impoverish'd the Kingdom of* France. *ib. p.* 189.

Nor was this *Pragmatick Sanction* of King *Lewis* the first of this Kind; for by the Sixth Article it appears, that those Liberties, Franchises, Immunities, *&c.* which King *Lewis* here enforces, were such as had before been granted to the Church and religious Places and Persons; but thro' Want of Discipline among themselves, and the Usurpations of the Court of *Rome*, they were in a great Measure obliterated and lost. And when by this pious Act of King *Lewis* they were likely to be restor'd, and that the Bishop of *Rome* found he could not oppose the pious Resolution and Inclination of the King, still to keep the Church in Subjection, tho' not to himself, (in Hopes of a more favourable Opportunity of resuming this usurp'd Right) he offer'd to invest the King with the Power of creating and instituting Pastors in every Dioceſs; which, its plain from the very Articles of the *Sanction*, he utterly disclaims, as not belonging to him. Particularly Art. 2. which shews his Intention to be for an entire Restitution of Sacred Elections. This malicious Cast of the Pope, *Richerius* confirms from *Chopinus*, *Tit. primo Monastici*, *Art.* 9. "When the Power of creating and "instituting a Pastor in every Dioceſs was given by the "Pope to this Holy King, and that the King's Am-"bassador had shew'd him the Pope's Diploma for it, "the good King replied thus to the Ambassador;" *I commend you for what you have transacted at* Rome *in Matters of Faith; but for the Present you have brought me from*

from the Pope, (viz. the foreſaid Power of Inſtitution,) I do not approve it, for I am ſenſible what Prejudice it will be to the Salvation of my ſelf and People. Upon which he threw the Diploma into the Fire. Richer. ibid. p. 190. Hence it is plain, that the Court of *Rome* always made it their Buſineſs to clog the free Courſe of Elections, being more willing to have Eccleſiaſtick Benefices in the Nomination of Kings than Sacred Electors; that by the interpoſing Authority of Chriſtian Princes, they might the more eaſily make a Breach in the Rampire of the common Rights and Apoſtolick Diſcipline. But the Piety of the King penetrated further than the Policy of the Pope, for by refuſing his Compliment, he fruſtrated his Holineſs's Deſign. The next *Pragmatick Sanction* was that of *Charles* VII. King of *France*. This was publiſh'd, during the Sitting of the General Council of *Baſil*, at the Council of *Bourges*, where the King, Dauphin, and States of *France* were preſent. The Proem ſhews it truly becoming the Character of a pious good Prince; for therein, firſt, the King diſclaims Sovereignty in Eccleſiaſtick Affairs, calling himſelf Protector and Defender of the Church of Chriſt and its Miniſters, and faithful Executor of thoſe moſt wholeſome Decrees, which by the Spirit of God were made for the ſtrengthening and preſerving the Doctrine and Diſcipline of the Church; to the Obſervation of which he acknowledges himſelf, as King of *France*, to be bound by Oath on the Day of his Inauguration. Secondly, as the Council of *Baſil* deriv'd its Authority from the Councils of *Conſtance* and *Seyn*, (which were afterwards continued at *Baſil*) and from two Popes, *Martin* V. and *Eugene* IV. it's certain that the Fathers of *Baſil* eſtabliſh'd many holy Decrees for the Reformation of the Church, which the Deputies of the Council brought to *France*. Thirdly, the King aſſembling the States to conſult what was moſt expedient in this Caſe, it was agreed they ſhould

meet

meet at *Bourges*, in which Synod the King preſided, *Lewis* the Dauphin, with ſeveral Princes of the Blood, and the Chiefs of the Kingdom both in Church and State being preſent; amongſt whom ſat the Deputies of Pope *Eugene*, and of the Council of *Baſil*. Fourthly, the Synod of *Bourges* would not determine any Thing propoſed by the Deputies of the Coencil of *Baſil*, before the Legates of Pope *Eugene* were heard; and then, upon mature Deliberation, they agreed to receive the Decrees of the ſaid Council, ſome of them without Alteration, others only with ſome neceſſary Modifications and Forms; not in the leſt queſtioning the Authority of the Council, but for the more commodious adapting them to the State of the *Gallican* Church, and Capacity of the Kingdom and People; it being highly neceſſary ſometimes, according to the Diverſity of Cuſtoms, Times and Places, to make Alterations in Laws. *Richer. ibid. p.* 191, 192.

The Firſt Decree of this *Pragmatick Sanction* declares the Uſefulneſs and Neceſſity of frequent calling General Councils. The Authority of a Council above the Pope in Matters relating to Faith, Extirpation of Schiſm, and Reformation of the Church in Head and Members: That the Council of *Baſil* ought not to be diſſolv'd or remov'd by the Pope or any other without the Conſent of the Council. The reſt of the Decrees of this *Sanction*, like theſe, being taken *verbatim*, as is ſaid before, out of the Acts of the Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil*, I ſhall omit; and, before I leave this *Pragmatick Sanction*, divert the Reader with the Management of the Editors in the Abrogation of it. *Con. T.* 12. *p.* 1432, 33. They tell us from the Tenth Book of *Gaguinus*'s *Compendium of the Acts of the Kings of France*, of a Report, that *Lewis* the Dauphin, (afterwards *Lewis* XI.) in his Fathers Life promis'd Pope *Pius* II. that if he ever came quietly to the Crown of *France*, he would recall the *Pragmatick*

tick Sanction. Which ſoon happening, the Pope put him in Mind of his Promiſe by Cardinal *Balva*; and King *Lewis* ſends the Cardinal to the Parliament of *Paris* with Letters for the abrogating of the *Sanction*. *Joannes Romanus* was at that Time the King's Proctor in Parliament, who, upon hearing the Cardinal's Buſineſs, with great Prudence and Preſence of Mind declared, *That for his Part he did not approve of the Abolition of ſo wholeſome a Law as the* Pragmatick Sanction, *and that to the utmoſt of his Ability he would oppoſe the Cardinal's Requeſt.* With him the Univerſity of *Paris* join'd, appealing to a Council. The Cardinal, not a little incens'd, threatens the Proctor, but went away from them *re infectâ*, as likewiſe from the King. The next Story about abrogating this *Pragmatick Sanction*, and which is as little to the Purpoſe as the former, they pretend to take from *Papyrius Maſſonus*'s Fourth Book of Annals of *Lewis* XI. which affirms, that *Lewis* XI. in the Beginning of his Reign, did take off the *Pragmatick Sanction*. But this is poorly made out, for they ſay, that Pope *Pius* II. in one of his Epiſtles, calls this *Pragmatick Sanction* void in it ſelf, as being made in a Time of Sedition and Schiſm, and diminiſh'd the Authority of him from whom all holy Laws take their Original. The Hiſtories of thoſe Times, even that of *Comines*, which wrote moſt in Favour of *Lewis* XI. do not make him appear a Man of the ſtricteſt Piety and Steadineſs, but theſe make him a very Occaſionaliſt; for when he was Dauphin of *France*, he gave his Aſſent to this *Sanction* at the Council of *Bourges*; and to make him promiſe his Holineſs if ever he came to the Crown to recal it, makes him like a wavering Trimmer of theſe Times. But the Editors, in the Relation of the Manner of the Abrogation of this Sanction, very imprudently deſtroy all again; for it was not recall'd publickly and in due Form, as it was firſt promulg'd, but poorly and ſneak-

ſneakingly in a private Manner. The Letters of Pope *Pius*, ſay they, commend the King's Deſign of taking off the *Pragmatick Sanction*. *Among the reſt*, (ſays he) *we highly applaud your Manner of taking off the* Pragmatick Sanction, *without the Convention and Conſultation of many. You are much in the Right on't, and you ſhew your ſelf a great Prince, who are not govern'd, but do govern. And certainly he is the beſt Prince who knows how to do Right of himſelf.*

This was excellent Advice to a King, who in his Minority had conſented to ſo Sacred a Decree, and at his Inauguration had ſworn to maintain, defend and obſerve it! But to enervate, as well as ridicule the whole Matter, the Editors ſubjoin theſe Words: *Pope* Pius *wrote theſe Things not without Fear, as he owns; and that was certainly true, for the Convention of States, the Biſhops and Clergy of* France, *would never have conſented to the abrogating the* Sanction.

In the Abrogation, as the Editors call it, of the *Pragmatick Sanction*, they make *Lewis* XI. a Saint in the Eyes of one Pope. But here again, *Con. T.* 12. *p.* 1433. they make a very Knave of him: For in the Year 1479, which was the 19th Year of King *Lewis*'s Reign, and the 9th of Pope *Sixtus* IV.'s Pontificate, they mention a Convention at *Orleans*, for the renewing the *Pragmatick Sanction*. The Occaſion of this, ſay they, was chiefly owing to the Craft and Artifice of King *Lewis*, to terrify the Pope, and prevent Exactions of the great Sums of Money extorted from *France*. This indeed is probable enough, conſidering the Man; but it no Way becomes them to ſpeak ſo diſreſpectfully of one whom the Infallible Judge had called wiſe and beſt of Princes. Indeed, as they ſay, it may well be wonder'd at, that *Binius*, *Coriolanus*, and the reſt of their Creatures and Friends of the Pontificate, who have treated of the Councils, are

are so silent in the Affair of this *Pragmatick Sanction.* [Truly I think it no Wonder, since I cannot imagine what can be said against Matter of Fact.] But this they take off presently, and say, *Let any one read the Eleventh Session of the* Lateran *Council, under Pope* Leo X. *where it is positively forbid every one to keep in their Houses, or in any publick or private Places, the* Pragmatick Sanction, *or any Chapter or Decree contained therein. That it should be expung'd all Archives and Places of Record, upon Pain of Excommunication, Deprivation, Infamy,* &c. *to Ecclesiastick Persons.* This Pragmatick Sanction indeed has been a great Offence and Scandal to the arbitrary Power of the Pope, and which the Editors would fain evade; but their Malice is very poor and impotent, their own Arguments turning upon them; and indeed, as they say of *Binius, Coriolanus, &c.* considering the Characters of the Men, I should be of their Mind, and wonder, if there were a Shadow of Reason on their Side; but as there is none, I think the Editors are more to be wonder'd at than they. But of this again in the Life of Pope *Pius* II.

Before we leave the Council of *Basil*, I shall beg Leave of the Reader to discuss some Arguments urg'd against the Power and Authority of this Council by several Great Men; in which I desire no better Assistance than that of *Richerius, ib. p.* 195. *& sep.* Tho' it may not be unnecessary here to premise something, and by great Men too, written in Defence of the Authority of a Council's being above the Pope. Among these, to omit many others, were *Abbas Panormitanus*; *Joannes Patriarcha Antiochen.* put forth a Treatise, which is extant among the Acts of the Council of *Basil.* But to crown all, *Nicolas Cusanus* wrote Three most learned Tracts *de Concordantia Catholica*, which are a well-stor'd Magazine of Antiquity, and Ecclesiastick Regimen; which nothing in this Age comes up to, if the Books were faithfully and correctly

rectly publiſh'd. But *Cuſanus* at laſt, in Hopes of a Cardinal's Hat, which he expected from Pope *Nicolas* V. turns Tail, and takes Part with the Court of *Rome*. Notwithſtanding which, and the new Part he was to act, he never retracted his Books *de Concordantia Catholica*, whatever *Bellarmine* ſays to the contrary, of which more hereafter. *Richerius, p. ibid.*

As for the Objections made by the Adverſaries of this Council againſt its Validity, they are generally taken from the Cardinals *Bellarmine*, *Baronius*, *Cajetan*, *Turrecremata:* Of all which, *Bellarmine* is the moſt polite and accurate; and theſe are manag'd *pro re nata* againſt the Council of *Baſil* by others, eſpecially *M. Andreas Vallius*, a bold and confident Paraſite of the *Roman* Court. Theſe, partly out of *Bellarmine*'s Second Book *de Concil. Auctoritate, cap.* 19. and partly out of his Third Book *de Eccleſia Militante, cap.* 16. draw the main Force of their Arguments, which we will reduce to the following Heads:

1. They moſt unfairly beg the Queſtion, by taking for granted, what they only ſuppoſe, *That the Pope is by Chriſt conſtituted abſolute and infallible Monarch of the Church.* Which being granted by their Adverſaries, they muſt needs, as *Gerſon* ſaith, *look upon the Pope to be all one with God*; and conſequently the Council of *Baſil*, which top'd this abſolute infallible Monarch, muſt be ſchiſmatical, and without a Head. But notwithſtanding theſe Flouriſhes, the great *Bellarmine* himſelf, in *l.* 3. *de Eccleſ. Milit. c.* 16. allows the Council of *Baſil* to be a lawful Council till the Depoſition of Pope *Eugene*, which was not meddled with till the 26th Seſſion, and then the Council had ſat above Six Years.

2. As to what *Bellarmine* ſays, That no Pope ever approv'd of what this Synod determin'd of its own Authority about a Council's being above the Pope; nay, that Pope *Eugene* did expreſly reject that by Name

Name in the 38th Seſſion; I anſwer, 1. A Synod lawfully met, as the Council of *Baſil* was, repreſents the Catholick Church, derives its Authority immediately from God, and, by Vertue of the Communion of Saints and Catholick Conſent, can decree. There can therefore be no need of external Authority, when the internal is obtained from God. 2. The Fathers of the Council of *Baſil* were ſupported by the Fourth and Fifth Seſſions of the Council of *Conſtance*, concerning the Authority of a Council above the Pope; the Canons of which Seſſions are no leſs than Five Times repeated, *viz.* in the 2d, 3d, 12th, 16th, and 18th Seſſions of the Council of *Baſil*, and approv'd by Pope *Eugene* himſelf, as has been already obſerv'd, and who allowed of this Council till the 26th Seſſion, *A. D.* 1437.

3. As to the Third Argument, That the Fathers of *Baſil*, at the Time of the Depoſition of Pope *Eugene*, were not a Council, but a Company of Schiſmaticks, Seditious, and conſequently of no Authority; it is begging the Queſtion to ſuppoſe the Council of *Baſil* ſchiſmatical, and without a Head: For Pope *Eugene* was elected by Order of a Council, and during its Seſſion; and if he ſhall, contrary to the Decrees of a Council, diſſolve or remove a Council, as if the Church were to be ſubject to the Deſpotick Will of a Pope, he is no longer Pope; but ought to be made ſenſible, that a Council derives its Authority from God, and that, as a Violator of the Canons, he ought to be depoſed. Certainly this muſt be granted, or they muſt contradict themſelves, That Pope *Eugene* did approve that a Council had immediate Power from Chriſt to direct and compel the Pope, and that a Council could not be diſſolv'd or tranſlated any where elſe, without the Authority and Conſent of the Fathers. Hence it naturally follows, that Pope *Eugene* could do none of theſe Things to the Council of *Baſil*,

ſil, and therefore he, not they, were ſchiſmatical and ſeditious.

4. They object, that there were but few Biſhops at that Time at *Baſil*; and that, contrary to the Method of Councils, they admitted Prieſts to ſupply their Places. This is as untrue as any Thing before urg'd; for at the Time of Pope *Eugene*'s Depoſition, and the Election of Pope *Felix*, there remain'd about Three hundred Biſhops preſent at this Council, either in Perſon or by their Proxies, as appears by their Synodal Epiſtle, *Ad univerſos Chriſti Fideles, de obediendo Con. Generalibus, &c. verſus finem.*

5. *Bellarmine* ſays, That God ſignally declar'd againſt the Fathers of *Baſil*, by viſiting the Place with ſo dreadful a Peſtilence, that the greater Part of thoſe who were there either died of it, or were forced to retire. This is of the ſame Piece with the reſt; for the Cardinal ought to have conſider'd, that Pope *Eugene* and his Party remov'd from *Ferraria* to *Florence* upon the ſame Occaſion, or rather upon a meer Apprehenſion of an approaching Peace. But further, to convince *Bellarmine* of his ridiculous Malice, it may with Modeſty be ſaid to look ſomewhat miraculous, that the Fathers of *Baſil*, and among the reſt the Cardinal of *Arles*, being ſatisfied of the Juſtice of their Cauſe, and deeply ſenſible of the Neceſſity of Reformation in the Church, for the avoiding of Schiſm and Hereſy, continued there Ten Years; whereas Pope *Eugene* and other Prelates fled from *Ferraria* to *Florence* upon the bare Rumour of a Peſtilence, being much more ſollicitous for their own Safety than that of the Church. But leaſt the Cardinal's Objection ſhould not anſwer, *Vallius* muſt put in his Oar to ſtrengthen the Side, by ſaying, That the City of *Bourges*, in which the *Pragmatick Sanction* was made, ſoon after the Diſſolution of the Council there, was conſum'd by Fire, as a Judgment on the Place. This

is measuring the Justice of a Cause from the Event; but he might better have reflected, for from the Time that *Charles* VII. of *France* heartily apply'd himself to the Reformation of the Church, and sincerely adher'd to the Council of *Basil*, where he had his *Pragmatick Sanction* ratified, his Affairs immediately chang'd Face, and the *English* soon lost what they had for many Years possess'd in *France*.

6. *Bellarmine* says, at the Time that the Fathers of *Basil* deposed Pope *Eugene*, the Council of *Florence* far exceeded that of *Basil* in Number both of *Latin* and *Greek* Bishops. And *Vallius*, not to be behind-hand with his Master *Bellarmine*, says, that none of the Eastern Bishops were or would be present at the Council of *Basil*; and therefore the Council of *Florence*, not *Basil*, was the œcumenical Council; because, says he, at that Time the Presence of the *Eastern* Bishops was altogether necessary, having not as yet revolted from the Church of *Rome*. His Bolt is soon shot! for the *Eastern* Bishops had long before separated from the *Latins*; else in the Council of *Florence*, why did the *Eastern* Bishops so earnestly sollicit an entire Union with the *Latins*, when the Points in Dispute between them were methodically argued by Disputants deputed by both Parties. This is plain from the Acts of that Council. But *Vallius* is again out in making Majority of Number carry the Preference between the two Councils; for since Pope *Eugene* consented to that Decree of the Council of *Basil*, which subjects a Pope to the Judgment of a General Council duly called, (as this of *Basil* was by himself) and that without the Consent of a Council he cannot dissolve or remove it, its plain that Majority of Number in the Council of *Florence* cannot exauctorate that of *Basil*.

7. *Bellarmine*, *Possevine*, and *Binius*, (*obnoxius Conciliorum Sarcinator*, as *Richerius* calls him) clamour mighti-

tily, that in the Council of *Florence*, by a contrary Edict, the Decrees of the Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil*, for ſetting a Council above the Pope, were repealed. But this is altogether falſe; for there was no ſuch Decree paſs'd in that Council, neither do they offer to produce the Decree, or mention the Seſſions in which it was made. But ſince *Bellarmine* is the chief Objector, he ſhall not only be Witneſs, but Judge in this Caſe. *De Con. Auctoritate, cap.* 13. "Altho', ſays he, afterwards in the Council of *Florence*, and the laſt *Lateran* Council, the Queſtion "about the Pope's Superiority above a Council ſeems "to be determin'd; yet, becauſe the Council of *Florence* hath not expreſly determin'd this, and the *Lateran* Council hath, ſome Men queſtion whether "the Council of *Florence* was really a General Council; which to this Day is doubted, even by the "Catholicks themſelves." And *Vallius* in plainer Terms expreſſes it, *Quart. Part. Quæſt.* 7. "*Satis conſtat Concilium Florentinum Auctoritatem Papæ ſupra Concilium non definiviſſe, etſi definiat eum eſſe Chriſti Vicarium, totius Eccleſiæ Caput, &c.* Its plain, ſays "he, that the Council of *Florence* did not determine "the Power of the Pope to be above a Council, "tho' it defin'd him Vicar of Chriſt, Head of the "whole Church, *&c.*" From hence it is beyond Contradiction, that thoſe Decrees of the Council of *Baſil*, till the 26th Seſſion, which defend this Power of a Council above a Pope, are a Record unrevers'd; and that Pope *Eugene* and his Adherents, who ſeparated from the Council of *Baſil*, were Schiſmaticks and Deſerters, and were notoriouſly irregular in the Breach of thoſe Decrees to which they had before conſented.

8. *Bellarmine* further urges, That the Fathers of *Baſil*, with their Pope *Felix* V. had repealed their own Decrees, and ſubmitted themſelves to *Nicolas* V. Succeſſor

ceſſor of Pope *Eugene* IV. which is notoriouſly falſe; for how could that be, when at the ſame Time *France*, *Germany* and *England*, and other *Northern* Provinces, ſtood by the Decrees of the Council of *Baſil*, and were very much enrag'd at Pope *Eugene* for hindering the Reformation, which was one great Cauſe of this Council's Meeting. But upon the Death of *Eugene* their Reſentment abated, and *Nicolas* V. being advanc'd to the Apoſtolick Chair, the long hop'd for Unity appeared more feaſible. Pope *Nicolas* V. forthwith ſends his Legates among the Chriſtian Princes to haſten the Peace of the Church; on which Errand he ſends *Nicolas Cuſanus* aforementioned to the King of *France* and the Emperor *Frederick*, according to *Ciaconius*, who wrote the Life of Pope *Nicolas* V. But *Monſtreletus*, who wrote the Hiſtory of thoſe Times, ſays, that the King of *France* ſo manag'd the Buſineſs with the Princes of *Germany*, and other Nations, that Pope *Nicolas* and *Felix* were made Friends. For although the King of *France* had acknowledg'd all the Acts of the Council of *Baſil*, except the Depoſition of Pope *Eugene*; yet remembring the Schiſms but lately extinguiſh'd in the Council of *Conſtance*, he never reſted till he had reconcil'd Pope *Felix* and the Fathers of *Baſil* to Pope *Nicolas*; which was accordingly done, and to put an End to or prevent any the like Schiſm again, Pope *Felix* formally reſign'd, and Pope *Nicolas* V. created him Dean of the College of Cardinals, and Perpetual Apoſtolick Legate in *Germany*; as appears in the Bull of Concord and Union at the End of the Acts of the Council of *Baſil*.

9. *Binius*, in his Notes on the Council of *Baſil*, affirms, That the Decrees of the Fathers of that Council were not allow'd by a General Conſent; and that many Prelates and Doctors of both Laws violently oppos'd thoſe Decrees. This in ſome Meaſure is true, but falſe in all the reſt. In the 33d Seſſion, the

two Decrees or Reſolutions of the Council's being above the Pope, and that he could not diſſolve or remove them againſt the Conſent of the Majority of them, were oppos'd by *Panormitanus*, *Cuſanus*, *Romanus*, and others; who exerted themſelves againſt theſe Decrees, more in Hopes of a Cardinal's Hat than any Thing elſe: But as to the other Decrees, *Binius* is as much out as he uſed to be, as appears plainly by the Acts of that Council; for there were none but the foreſaid who oppos'd any other Decrees.

10. *Binius* ſays, That, contrary to the Cuſtom always before practic'd in Synods, the Fathers of *Baſil* would not let Pope *Eugene* preſide in the Council: Which is very falſe; for his Legates did actually preſide, as appears in the 17th and 18th Seſſions; tho' they allow'd them no coercive Juriſdiction, and oblig'd them firſt to obſerve the Decrees of the Council of *Conſtance*, which Pope *Eugene* muſt have done if he had been preſent. Thus, when ſome Men want probable Arguments, they fly to the moſt groſs Falſhoods.

11. The ſame *Binius* complains, That the 18th Seſſion of the Council of *Baſil*, in which the Decrees of the Fourth and Fifth Seſſions of the Council of *Conſtance* were reviv'd, was held in the Abſence of *Sigiſmund* the Emperor, and the Ambaſſadors of the Kings of *Caſtile* and *England*. Which Objection the very Acts of the 18th Seſſion diſprove.

12. *Vallius*, among the reſt of the Errors which he unjuſtly charges the Council of *Baſil* with, ſubjoins this, *That the Fathers of* Baſil, *by determining the Bleſſed Virgin to be free from* Original Sin, *and that no Body for the future ſhould dare to teach or preach the contrary, were very much miſtaken, ſince after that Pope* Sixtus IV. *left all Men to their Liberty in this Point, and the Council of* Trent *afterwards approv'd this Determination*

tion of his. This is very wide of the Buſineſs, in relation to the Fathers of *Baſil*; for Pope *Sixtus* IV. was not promoted to the Pontificate till *A. D.* 1471. which was above Thirty Years after the Council of *Baſil*, and the Council of *Trent* was much longer after: So that the Fathers of *Baſil*, however Right or Wrong in their Determination, could not be ſaid to miſtake in relation to any Decree of Pope *Sixtus* or the Council of *Trent*. But to expoſe himſelf ſtill more, he goes on, and ſays, *That the Determinations of ancient Councils, which were neither repealed nor confirm'd* [by ſucceeding Popes], *were always eſteem'd of great Authority in the Church, by reaſon of the Multitude of Prelates and learned Men who uſually were preſent at Councils. And therefore, the Decree of the Council of* Baſil *about the immaculate Conception, whatever its Validity might be, tho' it was not Matter of Faith, was very much eſteem'd, by reaſon of the Multitude of Prelates and learned Men concern'd in it.* The Council of *Baſil* is oblig'd to *Vallius* indeed; for by the Inconſiſtency of theſe two Propoſitions he has brought them off, clearing them in the latter of what he had charg'd them with in the former. In which he is not unlike his Maſter *Bellarmine*, and his Brethren the Editors.

13. But after all, the Creatures of the Pontificate, not daring to truſt to the Strength of their Arguments, take a more ſure Method of damning the Credit of the Council of *Baſil:* For, as *Richerius* affirms from the Teſtimony of Perſons who very well knew Cardinal *Bellarmine*, it was at his Inſtigation, that the Council of *Baſil*, with all its ſynodical Acts, were utterly eras'd out of the *Roman* Edition of the Councils. An Action juſtly becoming the Abſolute Monarchy of *Rome*, to do that by Force which they could not do by Right. And therefore what *Gerſon* ſaid in the laſt Seſſions of the Council of *Conſtance*, *viz. That tho' many Things relating to the Doctrine of*

Faith, and the Diſcipline of the Church, were decreed, yet they could not be put in Practice without the Aſſiſtance of the Temporal Power, may properly be applied here. For in vain hath the Church decreed that a Council hath its Authority immediately from Chriſt, that the Pope is ſubject to the Judgment and Determination of a Council, and that the Church ought to be reform'd both in Head and Members; unleſs Chriſtian Princes, as Defenders and Protectors of Divine, Natural and Canon Laws, put thoſe Decrees in Execution. And therefore the Fathers of *Baſil*, in their Synodal *Reſponſ. dat. Baſil. Id. Jun. A. D.* 1439. very juſtly put this Quære: *Who can bear this moſt pernicious Error, that the Pope, by Vertue of his ſingle Power, ſhould tranſlate and remove at Pleaſure ſuch great Numbers of Prelates, and of moſt wiſe and learned Chriſtians gather'd out of all Parts of the World in Council? So that none ſhall dare to ſay to this Sovereign Pontiff, Why doſt thou ſo?* As if the whole Church of Chriſt were ſubject to the deſpotick Empire of the Pope; and that our Bleſſed Lord had left behind him another Sort of Power than Spiritually Miniſterial. *Richer. Hiſt. Con. Gen. l.* 3. *p.* 212.

A. D. 1440. A Council was held at *Frieſing* in *Bavaria*, in Pope *Eugene*'s Time; where among other Canons, the Fifteenth ſays: *No Prieſt ſhall preſume to ſay Maſs without Lights, nor dare to elevate the Hoſt before Conſecration, leaſt the People, adoring an unconſecrated Hoſt, ſhould be guilty of Idolatry.* This is a pleaſant Inference indeed to excuſe their own Idolatry, and inforce their Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, as if the inanimate Elements were alter'd in their Eſſence by Conſecration, and ſo conſequently merited Adoration. But if we ſenſibly perceive them to be ſtill Elements, is not the Idolatry the ſame after Conſecration as before?

The

The 17th Canon of this Council revives and maintains the old Cheat and Forgery, which we have often hinted; *viz. That the Priest shall inform the People, that Women as well as Men, in Case of Necessity, may baptize Children with the usual Form; viz. In the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: And that Fathers and Mothers, upon Occasion, may baptize their own Children after the same Manner.* Thus do they continue an old Abuse grounded upon a false Foundation: Which has not wanted cultivating in these latter Days; for here we may see from whence the Author of *The Rights of the Christian Church* took his Scheme of Lay-Administration in Holy Offices; not the only Abuses our wild Phanatical Enthusiasts have suck'd from the Dregs of Popery, and vilest Practices of the Church of *Rome.*

[1447.] Having done with the Council of *Basil*, we will proceed more particularly to the Life of Pope *Nicolas* V. He was of mean Extraction, but his forward Genius recommended him to the Care of Cardinal *Nicolas Albergotti* of *Bononia*, who soon introduc'd him to the Court of *Rome*; by which he was pitch'd upon for one of the Disputants in the Council of *Florence*; where he so signalis'd himself, that Pope *Eugene*, sensible of his great Abilities, sent him his Legate into *Germany*, to persuade the Emperor *Frederick*, and other Princes of the Empire, to side with him against the Council of *Basil.* This was accomplish'd, though, as has been observ'd by *Monstrelet*us, it was owing to the King of *France*; but, however it was obtain'd, Pope *Eugene* had entertain'd such kind Thoughts of *Sarzanus*, (for that was Pope *Nicolas*'s Name before) that he rewards his Service with a Cardinal's Hat, and the See of *Bononia.* Upon the Death of *Eugene* he is chosen Pope, soon after which, making Use not only of the Emperor's Interest but his Arms, he obliges his Rival *Felix* to quit; whom

he continues in the Number of Cardinals, and creates him his perpetual Legate in *Germany*. Pope *Nicolas* was a great Patron of Learning and learned Men, whom he generouſly encourag'd, and amply rewarded, and had an Opportunity of doing much more, if he had not ſo buſily concern'd himſelf in the Civil Wars of *Italy*. However he took many Opportunities of ſhewing his good Will to the Commonwealth of Learning; which he enrich'd with Variety of Monuments of ancient Writers, collected at a vaſt Expence from all Parts of the learned World, cauſing them to be fairly copied and plac'd in the *Vatican* Library. But beſides all other Occaſions which he made Uſe of to ſhew the ſtrong Propenſity of his Genius for promoting good Literature, the greateſt Opportunity that could throw it ſelf in his Way was *A. D.* 1453. and in the Seventh Year of his Pontificate, when the *Turks* took the City of *Conſtantinople*, and put an End to the *Eaſtern* Empire in the Chriſtian Line. Upon which the moſt learned Men of that Country, compell'd thro' Poverty and the Severity of the Conqueror's Yoke, betake themſelves to the *Weſtern* Part of the World, eſpecially to *Italy*, where Pope *Nicolas* V. well knowing the Value of this *Eaſtern* Treaſure, ſo warms the diſtreſs'd *Greeks* with his Bounty, that they in Return liberally diffuſe, not only the Knowledge of their Language, but of all Sort of more polite Literature, thereby inviting the *Latins* to a Taſt of ſomething more delicate and agreeable than their crabbed School Divinity. And that which ſtill help'd to advance the Grandeur of Pope *Nicolas*'s Character in his Promotion of Learning, was the Art of Printing, which being found out a few Years before, was a Means of preſerving aud handing down to theſe Times many excellent Monuments of Learned Men, which otherwiſe might have ſlept in Oblivion.

[1455.] Pope

[1455.] Pope *Nicolas* V. is ſucceeded by *Alphonſus Borgia*, a *Spaniard*, afterwards called *Caliſtus* III. whoſe Pontificate being ſhort, few Things of Moment were tranſacted in it. He died loaded with Years and Wealth, making Room for his Succeſſor *Æneas Sylvius*, who, upon his Advancement to the Papal Chair, takes upon him the Name of

[1458.] *Pius* II. a Name very diſagreeable to the Character and Actions of the Man. After the lighter Studies of his Youth, he betook himſelf to that of the Civil Law, wherein he acquir'd ſuch Reputation, that the Fathers of the Council of *Baſil* made him Secretary of the Council, Clerk of the Ceremonies, and Abridger of the Papers; in which Council, as One of the Twelve Cenſors, he often pleaded. Here was his firſt Riſe, and ſo long as he found it his Intereſt, he firmly adher'd to the Council of *Baſil*. About the Year 1437, when the Schiſm broke out between Pope *Eugene* and the Council of *Baſil*, notwithſtanding the Anathema's and other Cenſures which *Eugene* thunder'd againſt his Adverſaries, and tho' ſome privately withdrew, and others openly revolted to *Eugene*, *Æneas* ſtedfaſtly adher'd to the Council, as himſelf owns in his Bull of Retractations. *Con. T.* 13. *p.* 1411. *Cum nihil haberemus quod nobis auferri poſſet, perſeverandum putavimus, ne Partem quæ verior nobis apparebat relinquentes, Detrimentum Animæ faceremus:* "Having nothing to loſe, "we thought it our Duty to perſevere; leaſt, quit-"ting the Part which appear'd to us moſt juſt, we "ſhould run the Hazard of our Souls." After Pope *Eugene* was by the Council depos'd, he acknowledg'd *Felix* as true and rightful Vicar of Chriſt, *ibid. p.* 1404. In the Year 1439, he was promoted by *Felix*, and ſoon after ſent his Legate to the Emperor *Frederick*, by whom he was highly eſteem'd; and, *A. D.* 1442, is ſent for by him from *Baſil*, and made Prime Secretary

tary of the Empire, and a Senator: During which Time he trims cunningly between both Parties, neither condemning the Council of *Basil*, nor declaring for *Eugene*. But as soon as the Emperor and *Eugene* were reconcil'd, he tacks about with the same Gale, and rivets his Interest in both; for at the Diet at *Ratisbon* conven'd to heal the Schism, he was the Emperor's Proctor, by whom he was twice sent Ambassador to Pope *Eugene*; and at last, by the Persuasion of Cardinal *Sarzanus*, then Apostolick Legate in *Germany*) (afterwards Pope *Nicolas* V.) he submitted himself to Pope *Eugene*, who was not a little pleased with gaining a Friend of so considerable an Enemy.

The Christian Princes, especially of *Germany* and *France*, having long groan'd under the heavy Burden of Taxes laid on them by the Court of *Rome*, were very desirous of a Reformation in the Church, to correct these Abuses, and ease their Countries of the tyrannical Exactions and other Usurpations of the Ecclesiastick Monarch. The Court of *Rome* was sensible of the approaching Storm, which they endeavour to avert by all the Art and Stratagem they could invent. But so long as *Charles* VII. reign'd, the *Pragmatick Sanction* gain'd such firm Footing in *France*, that the several Popes that liv'd in that Time finding the King inflexible to their Purpose, ply his Son *Lewis* the Dauphin with their most refin'd Politicks to bring him into their Interest. Accordingly Pope *Nicolas* V. makes the Dauphin's Confessor a Cardinal; and, whether by that Means, or what else, the Dauphin (as we have hinted before) promis'd, when he came to the Crown of *France*, to recal the *Pragmatick Sanction*. But this was like to prove a Work of Time, for *Charles* VII. was likely to live many Years, as it fell out. Whilst Things were at this Pass, an unexpected Instrument starts up in the Person of Pope *Pius* II. to give the finishing Stroak to this great Affair.

For

For conſidering his former Practice and Pleading in the Council of *Baſil* againſt the arbitrary Power of the Court of *Rome*, they could entertain but ſmall and unpromiſing Hopes of his being their Friend, eſpecially in the Caſe of Reformation, in Defence of which he firſt became eminent, and recommended himſelf to the Fathers of *Baſil*. Whilſt he was a private Man, and ignorant of the Political Arts and Studies of the Court of *Rome*, (as he owns in the forecited Bull of Retractations) he was a ſtrenuous and undaunted Champion of Truth, and the Neceſſity of Reformation. But, when from poor *Æneas Sylvius*, and but Canon of *Trent*, he became firſt, Biſhop of *Trieſte*, then Biſhop of *Sena*, by his old Friend Pope *Nicolas* V. and at laſt Cardinal by Pope *Calixtus* III. he grew quite another Man; for thus arm'd with Grandeur, he made it his Buſineſs to entangle and perplex that Truth, which as a poor private Man he had bravely and honeſtly maintain'd. This was a plain Taſt of what the Church was to expect whenever he ſhould come to be chief Adminiſtrator in it, which ſoon after happen'd. Though ſome were ſo weak as to expect from his great Abilities and Promiſes, that he would do ſomething extraordinary in the Buſineſs of Reformation; yet, conſidering his prevaricating but a little before he was choſen Pope, they had no Shadow of Reaſon from his Actions to expect any Thing good from that Quarter. But ſuch were ſoon convinc'd of their Error; for having obtain'd the Papacy, he falls in immediately with the Meaſures of his Predeceſſors, and verifies the Obſervation, That a good Man and a good Pope are inconſiſtent.

Upon the Death of *Charles* VII. *Lewis* XI. aſcends the Throne of *France*; whom Pope *Pius* puts in Mind of his former Promiſe to recal the *Pragmatick Sanction*. But here his Holineſs had to do with a Perſon of as much

much Cunning, and as little Integrity, as if he had been educated in the Court of *Rome*. Pope *Pius*, upon his Advancement to the Holy See, ſends Letters to the Univerſity of *Paris*, promiſing them great Inſtances of his Favour, which was with no other Deſign than to cajole and wheedle King *Lewis*; which he perceives, and therefore is not very forward in performing his Promiſe; upon which the good Pope begins to ſtorm, and threaten both him and his whole Kingdom with Excommunication. But this does not move the crafty King, who by his Proctor in Parliament appeals to a General Council. This gave Birth to a great Scene of Intrigue; and the Pope finding himſelf match'd, betakes himſelf to other Arts, putting King *Lewis* in a Way to recal this *Pragmatick Sanction*, ſo as to meet with no Oppoſition; (for he well knew, the *French*, both Clergy and Laity, were ſtrenuous Aſſerters of it;) which was by doing it without conſulting the States and Parliament. *Lewis* conſents, and to humour his Holineſs's Vanity, in a Letter to him abrogates the *Pragmatick Sanction*; which is ſoon reviv'd again; for what with the Appeal of the Univerſity of *Paris* to a Council, and the Addreſs of the Parliament to retain the *Pragmatick Sanction*, or whether the Pope's Breach of his Promiſe to the King about conferring Benefices on ſome Perſons of his nominating, and forbearing to exhauſt the Treaſure of *France*, was the Occaſion, it's certain that the King reviv'd it again: Though, according to *Monſtreletus*, the Pope's own Vanity was the chief Cauſe of King *Lewis*'s reviving it again: For he no ſooner receives the King's Letter wherein he abrogates the *Sanction*, but in Ridicule he expoſes it to the People of *Rome*. *Richer. Hiſt. Con. l.* 4. *c.* 1.

About the laſt Year of his Pontificate, Pope *Pius* II. publiſhes his *Bull of Retractation*, wherein he recants all he did in the Council of *Baſil* againſt Pope *Eugene*

gene IV. declares, " All Kings and Princes that had " revolted from their Duty to the Apoſtolick See, " ſhould be reduc'd to their Obedience by Force; " That a Council ought to be ſubject to the Pope; " and forbids all People, under Pain of Excommuni- " cation, to appeal from the Pope to a Council." So that, to uſe the very Words of *Platina* and *Stella*, *Non Reges, non Duces, non Populos, non Tyrannicos, in ſe aut Eccleſiaſticum quempiam delinquentes, Bello, Cenſuris, Interdictis, Execrationibus perſequi priùs deſtitit, quàm eos ad Sanitatem rediiſſe cognoverit.* " He never left off perſecuting " Kings, or any Degree of People that offended him, " or any Eccleſiaſtick, with War, Cenſures, Inter- " dicts, *&c.* till he had reduc'd them." No doubt the foreſaid Authors give the Character of Pope *Pius* theſe Embelliſhments, to ſhew his extenſive Charity, which no Power or Difficulty whatever could hinder from exerting it ſelf; but the Reverſe is more properly his Due, for from his firſt Promotion to a Biſhoprick, his Arrogance appeared conſpicuous in all his Actions; but more when he obtained the Pontificate, as is plain from his Bull of Retractation, wherein he imperiouſly domineers over all Temporal Princes, and what he cannot effect as a Paſtoral Father, he reſolv'd to accompliſh as a Sovereign Biſhop: So that, as *Richerius, lib.* 4. *p.* 5. well obſerves, *The Church of Chriſt was become the Seat of Faction and Party-Intrigues.*

[1464.] *Peter Barbus* ſucceeds *Pius* II. and takes upon him the Name of *Paul* II. He was bred a Merchant, but his Uncle Pope *Eugene* IV. having obtain'd the Papal Chair, he betook himſelf to the Study of Letters, and after ſeveral Promotions was created Cardinal by him. He was no great Admirer of his Predeceſſor Pope *Pius* II. and therefore immediately upon his Advancement to the Apoſtolick See, he reſcinds Pope *Pius*'s Acts, and diſgraces his Friends and Adherents; but ſticks at no Means, either of Force

Force or Treachery, to enlarge the Pontifical Power. *A. D.* 1466. in a Conſiſtory, he condemns *George Pogebrachius*, King of *Bohemia*, of Hereſy, excommunicates him, and declares his Throne vacant, which he offers to the Emperor *Frederic*, but he refuſes the Preſent, as queſtioning the Right of the Donor, who beſtows it on *Matthias* King of *Hungary*, at the ſame Time ſending *Roverella* Biſhop of *Ferraria* his Legate into *Bohemia*, to ſtir up the People to rebel. *Platina* has ſpoken too plain in this Pope's Life, for which the Editors blame him, *Con. T.* 13. *p.* 1422, and ſay, he writes more like an Enemy than an Hiſtorian; and to take the Matter clean from *Platina*, they father his Account of Pope *Paul* II. on ſome anonymous Author in *Papia*; but ſubjoin, ſuppoſing it was *Platina*, *Who would not excuſe* Platina, *if he were angry*?

[1471.] About a Month after the Death of Pope *Paul* II. *Francis Ruvere*, Cardinal of St. *Peter*, is choſen Pope, and aſſumes the Name of *Sixtus* IV. He was a Man of great Learning and Abilities, which raiſed him to ſeveral conſiderable Dignities; but his towring Genius could not reſt till he had got Poſſeſſion of St. *Peter*'s Chair, to which he was as great a Scandal as any of his Predeceſſors. For Learning and Brightneſs of Parts he was above the common Size of other Pontiffs, and his Liberality in enriching the *Vatican* Library with the choiceſt Books that Money could procure, ſhew'd his Love to it. But his Morals were ſo impure and lewd, that the Repetition of them would offend a modeſt Ear. He was the firſt firſt that granted a publick Licence for Stews at *Rome*, by which Tax he yearly brought in vaſt Sums of Money into the Apoſtolick Treaſury. The only remarkable good Action of his Life, next to that of Learning, was his Patronage of *Platina* the Hiſtorian, who wrote the Lives of the Popes to this Pope's Time. He was born of mean Parentage at *Cremo-*

na in *Italy*; in his Youth a Soldier; but in his more mature Years he betook himſelf to Study, wherein he made great Progreſs. He was firſt entertained as a Domeſtick in Cardinal *Beſſarion*'s Family at *Rome*, who recommended him for his great Abilities to Pope *Pius* II. and by him was promoted to the Office of Apoſtolick *Abbreviator*. But upon the Death of Pope *Pius* he was removed from his Office by Pope *Paul* II. and ſtrip'd of all he had, for no other Reaſon than becauſe he was eſteemed by Pope *Pius* II. *Platina* deeply reſents this Treatment; and after long Attendance deſpairing of Admittance to the Speech of the Pope, he ſends him a Letter, wherein he threatens to appeal to ſeveral Kings and Princes, whom he ſhould perſuade to call a Council, and oblige him to give an Account of this irregular Proceeding. But poor *Platina* was miſtaken in his impotent Reſentment; for Pope *Paul* chaſtizes his Petulancy with Four Months Impriſonment in Irons, from which, by the Interceſſion of Cardinal *Gonzaga*, he was enlarged, and taken into his Protection. Three Years after, Pope *Paul* again commands him to be apprehended, and accuſes him of Treaſon; which he denying, is put to the *Strappado*, and other ſevere Torments. But when either by Artifice or Cruelty they could extort no Confeſſion from him, the poor Wretch is accuſed of Hereſy, becauſe he had formerly diſputed about the Immortality of the Soul. But his old Friends the Cardinals *Beſſarion* and *Gonzaga*, after a Year's Confinement, procured his Liberty. About Two Years after, *Sixtus* IV. ſucceeding *Paul* II. and well knowing the Innocency and Worth of the Man, takes him into his Family, prefers and enriches him, and, what he was highly capable of, commits the Vatican Library to his Keeping; a Truſt at that Time no Man was ſo worthy of as himſelf. He was, in the Opinion of *Eraſmus*, an excellent Hiſtorian, *ſi*

nactus

nactus fuisset: argumentum fælicius; "if he had not un-
"dervalued his Abilities by the Meanness of his Sub-
"ject." And here let us leave Pope *Sixtus* IV. least enquiring further, we find this the last good Act of his Life.

[1484] *John Baptist Cibo*, descended of noble Parentage, and promoted to several Dignities by *Sixtus* IV. is after his Death chosen Pope by the Name of *Innocent* VIII. Though his Pontificate lasted above Seven Years, yet he had few Opportunities of exerting himself, except in the old Instance of undoing what his Predecessors had done, and imitating the worst of their Actions. For in the Year 1487. he absolves the *Venetians*, whom Pope *Sixtus* IV. had excommunicated; and in *A. D.* 1489. he excommunicates *Ferdinand* King of *Naples*, for refusing to pay to the Church the Tribute which Pope *Sixtus* had released him from, commanding him to be deposed, and absolving his Subjects from their Allegiance.

[1492.] We are come now to one of the greatest and horriblest Monsters in Nature that could scandalize the holy Chair. His Life is so well known to the World, that I shall only mention what relates to the Affairs of the Church during his execrable Administration. *Alexander* VI. before called *Rhodorick Borgia*, was a *Spaniard* by Nation, born in *Valentia*, of the noble Family of *Borgia's*, and Nephew by the Brother's Side to Pope *Callixtus* III. by whom he was called to *Rome*, and made Archdeacon, Cardinal, and Vicechancellor of the Apostolick See; afterwards Bishop of *Portua*, and Dean of the Sacred College. At last, upon the Death of *Innocent* VIII. he is chosen Pope, which Dignity he purchased of the Cardinals by Bribes, partly of Money, partly of Lands and Castles belonging to the *Roman* See. For the Good of the Church he did nothing: He had other Thoughts in his Head, the Advancement of his Secular

lar Intereſt out of the Eſtate of it; and to raiſe his own Family by its Revenues, were his ſole Care: And therefore, contrary to all Right and common Modeſty, he amaſſes up an immenſe Treaſure by the Sale of Diſpenſations. The Editors indeed ſay as little of him as they can; but they muſt ſpeak ſome foul Thing of him, whoſe Life was ſo notoriouſly ſcandalous in the Eye of all the World; and therefore they lump his Character at once, and ſay, *Initium Pontificatus a Pietate deſumpſit*; "He ceas'd to be a good Man "when he became Pope." *Con. T.* 13. *p.* 1468. The firſt Handſel he received for his diſpenſing Power, was from *Lewis* XII. King of *France*, for divorcing his Wife *Joan*, for no other Reaſon than becauſe ſhe was barren and unhandſome. But that which he had chiefly in View, was the ſettling of the Secular Principality of the Pontificate on his Baſtard-Son *Cæſar Borgia*, and thereby make the Patrimony of St. *Peter* the Inheritance of his own Family. In this Attempt neither Father nor Son were wanting. The Son with his Father's Help raiſes an Army, and moſt unjuſtly, without any Provocation, drives the Lords of *Flaminia* and *Umbria* out of their Towns; and the Father creates the Son Duke of thoſe Provinces, and Prince of the Holy See, by Vertue of his Apoſtolick Authority. But theſe ſacrilegious Undertakings were ſoon daſh'd by the Hand of Providence; for having invited to an Entertainment the moſt wealthy of the Cardinals, whoſe large Poſſeſſions had rais'd his avaritious Appetite to a moſt voracious Pitch, he intended to have ſeiz'd their Eſtates as ſoon as he had diſpatched them with a poiſon'd Draught; but by a fatal (or rather providential) Miſtake he was the firſt Taſter of it, and fell into that Snare which he had laid for others. His beaſtly Morals, his immenſe Ambition, his inſatiable Avarice, his deteſtable Cruelty, his furious Luſt, and monſtrous Inceſt with his

Daughter *Lucretia*, are at large deſcrib'd by *Guiccardine*, *Ciacconius*, *de Rebus Ital. l.* 1. and other Hiſtorians of that Time, not to ſpeak of *Brietius*, *Annal. ad an.* 1492, *& ſeq.* and other more modern Writers, notwithſtanding what *Bzovius*, *Annal. T.* 18. ſays to the contrary, who would fain waſh this Black Moor white.

Pope *Pius* III. who ſucceeded *Alexander* VI. ſat but 26 Days, and therefore I ſhall not interrupt the Story relating to Reformation in the Church from Part of Pope *Alexander*'s Time to Pope *Julius* II.

Tho' the Court of *Rome* had ever ſince the Council of *Conſtance* moſt ſtudiouſly endeavour'd wholly to obliterate the very Notion or Thought of the Neceſſity of Reformation in the Church, to blot out of the Minds of all Men the Acts of the Council of *Baſil*, and the Decrees of the *Pragmatick Sanction*, and to aſperſe thoſe with Suſpicion of Schiſm and Hereſy among the unthinking People who ſhould propagate any ſuch Thing; yet they fail'd of their wiſh'd-for Succeſs; for there were many good and pious Men ſtill, who publickly deplor'd the Ruin of Eccleſiaſtick Diſcipline and good Morals, and demonſtrated the Neceſſity of Reformation in both. To which nothing contributed ſo much as the moſt ſcandalous and monſtrous Actions of Pope *Alexander* VI. For Men did not now in Corners bemoan the ſad State of the Church, but complain'd in publick that if ever, now was the Time to reform both in Head and Members. This ſo rouz'd *Charles* VIII. King of *France*, that forthwith for that very End he conſults with the moſt learned Theologiſts of the Univerſity of *Paris*; who in Anſwer to his Demand ſay, *That the Pope once in Ten Years was oblig'd to call a General Council, repreſenting the Univerſal Church; and eſpecially at this Time when there was ſo great a Diſorder both in Head and Members, which was notorious to the whole*

whole World. To the Second Queſtion they anſwer, *That if in Time of Neceſſity, as at this preſent, or Ten Years ſince the laſt Council, the Pope being required to ſummon a Council, ſhall refuſe or delay; that then the Princes, as well Eccleſiaſtick as Temporal, and other eminent Members of the Church, may meet together, and be a Council repreſenting the whole Church.* To the Third Queſtion they reply'd, *In Time of Neceſſity,* &c. *when any conſiderable Part of Chriſtianity, as ſuppoſe the Kingdom of* France, *or the moſt Chriſtian King its Repreſentative, ſhould demand of the Pope and other Parts of the Church to call a General Council, to provide for the Neceſſity of the Church, and he or they refuſe, neglect or defer to call the ſaid Council; nevertheleſs they who ſhall obey and appear, may without the reſt hold a Council, and provide for the Neceſſity of the Church. Rich. Hiſt. Con. Gen. l. 4. p. 74, 75.* *Alexander* VI. does not care to hear of theſe Things, he too well knew a Council would upon ſlight Inſpection find him a foul Offender, and therefore to ſecure himſelf in his ill-gotten Dignity, and to ſtrengthen himſelf with the Sinews of War, he extorts vaſt Sums of Money, by laying the Tax of the Tenth Part of their Income from the Clergy of *France,* under Pretence of carrying on the War againſt the *Turk,* all which was done by his own ſingle Authority. This indeed was no new Impoſition, his Predeceſſor Pope *Innocent* VIII. having offer'd at the ſame; but the Univerſity of *Paris* three Times appealed to a General Council againſt ſuch a Practice; and eſpecially in the Third, forbid any of their Members to be aiding or aſſiſting, by Advice or otherwiſe, to the Court of *Rome* in Prejudice of the ſaid Univerſity and its Privileges, in this Matter of paying Tythes to the Pope; and at laſt the whole Sacred Faculty of Divinity in the Univerſity of *Paris,* unanimouſly agree in this Determination, *That the Church is ſuperior to a Pope, whom they deny to be abſolute Monarch of it; and that he*

cannot arbitrarily, and of his own Power, without conſulting the Clergy, lay ſuch a Tax as that of Tythes upon them. Rich. ib. p. 57, 69, 71, 73, 74, 75, *&c.* But to proceed to the next Pope.

[1503.] *Alexander* VI. dying ſuddenly of Poiſon, which he had prepar'd for others, and *Pius* III. Nephew of *Pius* II. holding the Pontificate but 26 Days, dying, as is ſuppos'd by the Editors, of Poiſon too; which was now grown very faſhionable in *Italy*. *Con. T.* 13. *p.* 1477. *Julian Rovere*, Cardinal of *Oſtia*, ſucceeds him by the Name of *Julius* II. a Man for diabolical Cunning and Pride no Way behind his pious Predeceſſor *Alexander* VI. to avoid whoſe Treachery and Tyranny, Cardinal *Julian* was twice forc'd to retire to *France*. And it is plain from what after follow'd, that *Alexander* well knew the Man, by the Caution he gave the Conclave, *viz.* To have a watchful Eye over him, leaſt he ſhould prove as *Sylla* ſaid of *Julius Cæſar*. He was ſenſible of the Jealouſy of his Colleagues, whom, notwithſtanding all their Care and Foreſight of his Perfidy and Treachery, he by a moſt ſurprizing Wile cheated: For when he had a Mind to the Pontificate, he was the Author of that ſolemn and authentick Inſtrument which the Cardinals were to ſign and ſwear to before they enter'd the Conclave to elect. The Contents of which were, *That a Free General Council ſhould be effectually held for reforming the Church in Head and Members: For recovering the Ariſtocratical Government in the Colledge of Cardinals; ſo that a Pope ſhould not determine any Thing of Moment in the Government of the Church without their Conſent.* This Inſtrument was ratified with horrid Execrations, which being by the reſt of the Cardinals ſign'd and taken, they were not a little ſurpriz'd to find the profligate *Julian* the Author and Promoter of it. Hoping therefore for ſome Good from this promiſing Turn, their old Suſpicion of him ceas'd,

and they entertain'd ſuch kind Thoughts of him, that they choſe him Pope. Having thus by Stratagem ſecur'd himſelf of the Pontifical Chair, inſtead of keeping the Oath which he had lately made, he projects with himſelf how to keep his ill-gotten Title. Firſt therefore he begins to liſt Soldiers, which he quarter'd in *Italy*, by that Means depriving the People of their Liberty, and any Power of injuring him. *Guiccardine*, who being an *Italian*, was far from ſpeaking any Thing in Favour of the *French*, yet is forc'd to tell this plain Truth of Pope *Julius* II. in Defence of *Lewis* XII. *viz.* That it was *Julius* that incens'd that King againſt the *Venetians*. In ſhort, as may be plainly ſeen in the foreſaid Author from the Eighth to the Thirteenth Book, this Pope minded no Promiſe, Oath, or Obligation, but what immediately ſquar'd with his preſent Intereſt. Thus he dealt with the King of *France*, for having by the Aſſiſtance of his Troops taken *Faventia*, *Ariminum*, *Ravenna*, and *Cervia* from the *Venetians*, and annex'd them to St. *Peter's* Patrimony; in Requital, truly he caſts about how to deprive the King of *France* of his Hereditary Right of the Dutchy of *Milan*; and to drive him out of *Italy*; where he could not bear to ſee any Body greater than himſelf. To ſhew his Ingratitude, and provoke King *Lewis* to quarrel with him, he confederates with the Kings of *England* and *Spain*, and the *Venetians* and *Swiſs*, againſt him. He likewiſe arms the Emperor againſt *Lewis*, by whom the Emperor had before been very much oblig'd. The Pretence to wheedle ſo many Princes and States into his Intereſt was, That the King of *France* had a Mind to get all *Italy* into his Poſſeſſion. Of which Aſperſion *Guiccardine* clears the King, affirming, that he had no other Deſign than to ſecure himſelf, and maintain his Patrimony in *Italy*. Purſuant to which, *Lewis* makes large Conceſſions, and ſtoops to Terms below the Majeſty

of a King, to gain his Holineſs's good Eſteem. But the more he is courted, the ſhyer he is, and grows hardned in his Reſentment againſt the King of *France* and his Confederates; declaring in a great Aſſembly, that he look'd upon thoſe as Enemies that ſhould adviſe him to Peace with *France*. Being thus inclin'd, contrary to the Law of Nations, which the moſt barbarous and ſavage obſerve inviolably, the Duke of *Savoy*'s Embaſſador is by him put to the Torture, and ſeveral Cardinals are impriſon'd for adviſing him to Peace. Theſe violent Motions were peculiarly proper to him, and the Violation of the Oath he took as Cardinal, and confirm'd with dire Imprecations at the ſame Time, was the direct Impulſe of his wicked Inclinations. Wherefore *Guiccardine* from hence takes Occaſion to blame King *Lewis*'s Mildneſs, who ought rather to have corrected the Pride and Arrogance of *Julius* by Arms, than gentle Means. Which the King by many Provocations was at laſt compel'd to; tho' before he proceeded to Force, to juſtify himſelf to the World, he commands the States of his Kingdom to aſſemble at *Orleans*; in his Mandate to whom he complains, "Of the many Uſurpations of "the Pope on the Rights and Privileges of the *Gal-* "*lican* Church, and the Laws of that Nation; which "for certain Reaſons he had patiently born, hoping "by fair Means he might have been perſuaded to "deſiſt. But he was ſo far from liſt'ning to any Ac- "commodation, that he declar'd War, and incited "his Subjects in *Italy*, particularly the *Genoeſe*, to re- "bel. Wherefore he demands their Opinion what "was moſt neceſſary to be done." Accordingly the Repreſentatives of the Church and State meet at *Orleans*, and adjourn to *Tours*, where Eight Articles are diſcuſs'd and concluded.

1. The Firſt was, Whether a Pope ought to make War on Temporal Princes in thoſe Countries which do

do not belong to the Patrimony and Dominion of the Church? The Council unanimouſly conclude, That a Pope neither could nor ought. This was neceſſarily previous to oppoſe the Univerſality of Power which Pope *Julius* had aſſum'd in all Princes Dominions. And it was Time for all Princes to look to themſelves, ſince this Pope Militant had declar'd, That he would make as bold with St. *Paul*'s Sword, as his Predeceſſors had with St. *Peter*'s Keys. *Con. T.* 13. *p.* 1481.

2. Whether it was lawful for a Prince, not only to defend himſelf, but to invade the Terrritories of the Church in Poſſeſſion of the Pope, his declared Enemy; not with an Intent to keep them, but to hinder him from offending himſelf and his Subjects? It was concluded, That a Prince with ſuch Reſtrictions might.

3. Whether it was lawful, upon ſuch an unjuſt Aggreſſion, for a Prince to withdraw his Obedience from the Pope, who had incited ſeveral Princes and States to invade the foreſaid Prince's Dominions? It was concluded, That a Prince might withdraw his Obedience from the Pope, not totally and indiſtinctly, but for the Defence of his Temporal Rights.

4. Such Subſtraction of Obedience being lawfully made, it was queſtioned, What that Prince and his Subjects, as well Eccleſiaſticks at Laicks, ſhould do in Matters for which they us'd to have Recourſe to the Apoſtolick See? It was concluded, that the ancient common Law, and the *Pragmatick Sanction*, taken from the Decrees of the Council of *Baſil*, ſhould be obſerv'd.

5. Whether it be lawful for any ſuch Chriſtian Prince to defend another Prince confederated with him, and whoſe Protection he had legally eſpouſed? The Council concluded, He might.

6. If a Pope ſhall pretend, That any Property or Right belong to him, as Part of the Patrimony of

the *Roman* Church; and on the other Hand the Prince affirms it to be his Right, but refers the Controverſy to the Determination of good and honeſt Men; Whether in that Caſe, all others excepted, the Pope ought to make War upon that Prince? And if he doth, Whether that Prince may not reſiſt, and other Princes his Allies aſſiſt him? The Council concluded, That it was lawful for that Prince to reſiſt *de facto*, and others aſſiſt him *de jure*.

7. If the Pope will not accept what a Prince honourably and according to Law offers; but on the contrary, not obſerving the due Courſe of Law, ſhall pronounce any Sentence againſt ſuch a Prince: Whether the Pope ought to be obey'd? Eſpecially at a Time when it was neither prudent nor ſafe for ſuch a Prince to go or ſend to the See of *Rome*, and defend himſelf judicially. The Concluſion was, No Prince was oblig'd to obey any ſuch Sentence.

8. If a Pope, not obſerving due Courſe of Law, but proceeding unjuſtly, ſhould arbitrarily publiſh any Cenſures againſt Princes, their Subjects and Confederates at that Time oppoſing him, whether he ought to be obey'd, and what Remedy ought to be apply'd? The Council agreed, That ſuch Sentence was null in it ſelf, and that it was not obligatory by Law or any other Way. *Richer. Hiſt. Con. Gen. l. 4. p.* 83.

However, notwithſtanding theſe Determinations of the Council of *Tours*, they reſolve firſt to ſend Legates from the *Gallican* Church to Pope *Julius* II. to admoniſh him to deſiſt from theſe Undertakings, and incline him to Peace. But if he would not hear the Legates, that then they would appeal to a General Council, according to the Decrees of the Council of *Baſil*, and proceed thereupon.

Whoever conſiders the Reaſonableneſs of the Acts of this Council of *Tours*, promulg'd by the Conſent and Advice of all the Biſhops of the *Gallican* Church, and

and the moſt learned Divines and Lawers of that Kingdom, and examines them by the Rule both of Divine and Natural Law, he will find ſufficient Cauſe to admire the Impudence of *Binius* for calling this Council a Cabal. Nor is *Vallius, de ſuprem. Poteſt. Papæ, l. Par.* 2. *Queſt.* 1. more civil; who ſays, *That the Pope has a Deſpotick Power over all Chriſtians, and that it is not lawful to reſiſt the Pope oppreſſing any one, even tho' he were a King.* From whence he concludes a Council has no Power over a Pope. But how inconſiſtent is he with himſelf in another Place, *ibid. Part.* 4. *Quæſt.* 2. *ad Calcem*, where he ſays, *If it ſhould happen that a General Council is abſolutely neceſſary, ſo that without it all Things in the Church muſt run to Ruine; and that the Pope cannot be prevailed upon to call one, in ſuch Caſe the Cardinals may call one; and if they refuſe, then the Primates of the ſeveral Kingdoms may meet and ſummons their Suffragans; And, at laſt of all, if the Primates ſhall refuſe to call a Council, then the Biſhops meeting together in one Place, may lawfully provide for the Neceſſities of the Church.* This is rare Inconſiſtency, *Andrew* againſt *Vallius*, and the Catholick againſt the *Roman*. But to return to the Story.

Notwithſtanding the importunate and preſſing Inſtances of the Legates from the Council of *Tours*, to deſire Pope *Julius* to call a Council, he would not be prevailed upon, but reſolutely broke through the Oath he took before his Election, and which oblig'd him in two Years to call a General Council. His Mind is wholly bent upon enlarging the Patrimony and Dominion of the Church, which at that Time labour'd under a greater Neceſſity of Reformation than Augmentation of Revenues. To compaſs this great Deſign, he encourages all his warlike Preparations with his Preſence, and beſieges *Bononia* and *Mirandola* in Perſon. *Guiccard. l.* 10. And ſome Time after being ſeiz'd with ſo violent a Diſtemper, that

the

the Physicians despair'd of his Life, tho' at a Time when he should have had other Thoughts in his Head, he talk'd of nothing but War and Destruction. *Ibid. l.* 11. Whereas on the other Side, King *Lewis*, who had arm'd in his own Defence, and not as an Aggressor, uses all the gentle Means imaginable to quiet this turbulent Prelate; who push'd him so close, that he was forc'd to invade the Patrimony of the Church, where he behav'd himself with the utmost Tenderness, and was so far from taking Advantage of the Victory he gain'd at *Ravenna*, that he would not suffer the least Publick Rejoicing in any Part of his Dominions; being often heard to say, That tho' he never willingly or knowingly had offended the Apostolick See or the Pope, yet for the Reverence he had to both he would willingly ask Pardon.

Nothing having been left unattempted to bring Matters to an Accommodation, and incline the Pope to call a Council, in order to settle the disturb'd State of the Church, several Cardinals, under the Protection of *Maximilian* the Emperor, and *Lewis* King of *France*, *A. D.* 1511. call a Council at *Pisa*.

In the Account of this Council the Editors are very partial and unfair, all of them, even *Crabb* and *Cossart*, leave out this *Concilium Pisanum secundum*, and only name it; and both they and their *Index expurgatorius*, *Hisp. Madrit. A. D.* 1667. *&* *Index Rom.* 1664. *p.* 29. damn it, because it makes against them, tho' it was called by the Emperor, King of *France*, and Cardinals, and kept only by *Catholicks*, (as they call them) and that according to the Constitutions and Decrees of their own General Councils of *Constance* and *Basil*; and the Council it self, both in the Time it sat, and after, called *Sacrum Concilium Pisanum*, as appears from the Title of the printed Copy, *A. D.* 1514. *Constitutiones factæ in diversis Sessionibus Sacri Generalis Con-*

Concilii Piſani. Vid. Biſhop *Barlow, de Studio Theologiæ*, printed at *Oxford*, *A. D.* 1700.

But before we proceed to take Notice of the Authenticknes of this Council and its Acts, it will be neceſſary to ſee how the Editors behave themſelves towards it, whether as a Council, or a ſchiſmatical Convention. And herein they are not ſparing either of Railing or Nonſenſe. For *Coſſart*, *Con. T.* 13. *p.* 1486. begins with a very unlucky Blunder, entitling it, *Conciliabulum Piſanum œcumenicum*, which indeed is a very odd Expreſſion, and diſagreeable in Terms; for none but the Editors are found to call that Univerſal which is Particular and Diminutive, as the Word *Conciliabulum* plainly implies, which ſignifies no more than a Cabal, or Meeting of a few; but the Word *œcumenical* is more, and affects a larger Number. But to the Matter of this Council, as they relate it, *ibid. When Pope* Julius, (ſay they) *had oblig'd himſelf by Oath to hold a General Council within two Years after his Advancement to the Apoſtolick Chair, being prevented by lawful Impediments, ſeveral Cardinals, with other Schiſmaticks and Hereticks,* (as they are pleaſed to term them in the Third Seſſion of the *Lateran* Council) *had the Impudence to call a General Council without the Authority of the Supreme Pontiff, and to ſummons,* &c. *in Form, as if they had been a legal Body: And that, contrary to the Council of* Conſtance, *it was above Ten Years ſince the laſt General Council; and therefore ſince Pope* Julius *neglected to call one, it was Time for them to do it.* This the Editor's take from the Pope's Bull of Indiction of the *Lateran* Council, adding withal, *That to cover the Baſeneſs of this Action, the Council of* Piſa *publiſh'd all their Orders in the Names of the Emperor* Maximilian *and* Lewis *King of* France, *tho' 'tis certain they were both ignorant of any ſuch Thing.* And this they pretend to confirm by *Surius*'s Authority, tho' it utterly deſtroys it. *ibid. When theſe mad Doings* (ſays he) *began to*

tend

tend to a Schism, Pope Julius *sends very kind Letters to them to invite them to return to the Peace and Unity of the Church; otherwise, tho' against his Will, he should be forc'd to punish them. This Admonition prevail'd with Three Cardinals, but the rest continued obstinate, which was occasioned by the Encouragement of the King of* France, *for which he was afterwards excommunicated. Nor was the Emperor altogether innocent in this Affair, tho' he afterwards withdrew from this Faction.* Agreeable to which is *Onuphrius*'s Account in the Life of Pope *Julius*, in these Words: *The* French *puffed up with Success, and having the Emperor and the Cardinals that had revolted from the Pope on their Side, they call a Council at* Pisa, *to which they cite the Sovereign Bishop; who, good Man! having endeavoured all he could to make Peace with the* French, *now grown insolent with their late Victory at* Ravenna, *exhorts King* Lewis *to dissolve the Council of* Pisa; *which he refusing to do, the Pope calls the* Lateran *Council at* Rome. *Ibid. p.* 1487. Thus far the Editors out of the foresaid Authors; and which contain the most ill-patch'd Contradictions and ridiculous Inconsistencies that ever were invented: For,

1. They say, That Pope *Julius* could not perform his Oath for the calling a Council within two Years, because he was lawfully impeded. This is directly false; for, as Pope *Julius* himself owns in the foresaid Bull of Indiction of the *Lateran* Council, they charge him with Neglect of calling a Council according to his Oath, and therefore they did it. Besides, it is plain he had no Business upon his Hands to hinder his calling a Council, except his Wars with the *French* King, which were occasioned by nothing more than his neglecting to perform his Oath, and call a Council: Which Occasion had ceas'd upon his calling a Council.

2. As to the Charge on the Cardinals, for calling a Council without the Pope's Authority, and that their In-

Indiction was not juriſdicial, I ſhall refer the Reader to the judicious and ſincere *Richerius*, *Hiſt. Con. Gen. l.* 4. *Par.* 1. *p.* 149. who, arm'd with the Authority of the beſt of their Canoniſts, lays down theſe two as poſitive Axioms. Firſt, That when a Pope is to be accus'd of any Irregularity, his Authority is not requiſite in calling a Council; for then a Council is above a Pope, and has Power to judge him. Secondly, when a Pope is negligent in calling a Council, becauſe he will not conſent to the calling a Council, a Council may declare againſt a Pope ſo refuſing, as a Heretick ſuſpected; and in ſuch a Caſe his Power devolves upon the Council. This that zealous Champion of the Pontificate Cardinal *Turrecremata* owns, *Summ. de. Eccleſ. l.* 3. *c.* 8. where he ſays, *In ſuch a Caſe the Cardinals have the Power of calling a Council.* And that this was Pope *Julius*'s Caſe, is plain from all that write in Favour of him; for the two Years being laps'd, within which Time he had ſworn to call a Council, he was undoubtedly guilty of Neglect. But the greateſt Scruple of all is this; granting, That in the foreſaid Caſes the Cardinals have the Power of calling a Council, yet this Power is lodged in the College, and not in the ſmaller Number; which is the preſent Caſe, there being but Nine Cardinals concern'd in the calling this *Piſan* Council. To this, *Richerius*, *ibid. p.* 150. *Sect.* 6. readily and fully replies, The Pope being excluded by reaſon of an Accuſation lodg'd againſt him, conſequently his Adherents are excluded too; and therefore as the Pope was excluded from calling the *Piſan* Council, ſo likewiſe were the Cardinals his Adherents, and the Power of calling the Council devolv'd upon thoſe Cardinals who were not of his Party; for it is not to be ſuppos'd that thoſe Cardinals that were of his Intereſt would act againſt him, tho' the Neceſſity of the Church requir'd it. But to return to the Inconſiſtencies of the Editors.

3. The

3. The Editors did very ill consult the History of these Times, in saying, that this Council of *Pisa*, the better to colour the Baseness of their Actions, publish'd their Orders in the Names of the Emperor *Maximilian* and *Lewis* King of *France*, who knew nothing of the Matter; which is a most notorious Falshood, as appears from the Edicts of those two Princes. *Richer. ibid. p.* 177, 179. The Emperor complains in his of the sad Calamities the Christian Religion in general labour'd under for Want of Reformation in the Church, insists upon the Decree of the Council of *Constance*, and his Holiness's Oath for the calling a Council; which the Pope neglecting or delaying, he instantly presses the Cardinals, whose Right it was, to call one. The King of *France*'s Edict is to the same Purpose, but longer and more particular.

4. The Citation from *Onuphrius* is utterly false; for, as we have noted already, the *French* King was so far from insulting for his Successes, or taking any Advantage of his Victory at *Ravenna*, when the greatest Part of St. *Peter*'s Patrimony lay at his Mercy; that he would not so much as permit any publick Rejoicings for them; but, tho' at the Head of a victorious Army, su'd for Peace with the greatest Humility, at a Time when he might have extorted it upon what Terms he had pleased. And as to the other Part of the Citation, *viz.* That the Pope had used his utmost Endeavours to reconcile the King of *France*, it's as notoriously false as the other; for his Holiness was the Aggressor in the Quarrel, King *Lewis* having suffer'd many Provocations and Insults from him, and long expostulated with him, before he could be persuaded to arm in his own Defence.

Before we proceed to the Acts of this Council, it will be of use to inform the Reader of *Labbe*'s Observation on this and the Council of *Tours*, both which he

he condemns as Sham-Councils or Cabals, tho' upon no better Authority than that of *Binius*, *Coriolanus*, and ſuch like furious Bigots. Which *Labbe* had the leſt Reaſon to do, conſidering how contemptibly both he and his Partner *Coſſart* have often in their Edition of the Councils treated *Binius*, as we have before noted, ſeldom mentioning him but with Suſpicion of his Fidelity. *Labbe*, in his Obſervation, *Con. T.* 13. *p.* 1488, deplores the Acts of the Council of *Tours* being publiſh'd by an anonymous Author, *A. D.* 1512. calling the Collectors of them heretical and ſchiſmatical: Uſual Expreſſions with the Editors and others when they are at a Loſs! But for his own Reputation, he ought to have ſpar'd the notorious Untruth which he ſubjoins, *viz. That* Lewis XII. *in his Mandate*, A. D. 1513, *ſhould call that of* Tours *a pretended Council, and that he would never ſhew them any Favour or Countenance.* This is both ridiculous and falſe; for, Firſt, it is Nonſenſe to make King *Lewis* ſay he would ſhew them no Favour or Countenance, when that Council was diſſolv'd a Year before. And Secondly, it is not to be ſuppoſed King *Lewis* ſhould ſay any ſuch Thing of thoſe whom he had call'd together by his expreſs Mandate; as plainly appears from the Mandate it ſelf. *Richer. Hiſt. Con. Gen. l.* 4. *Par.* 1. *p.* 81. So that *Labbe* muſt be guilty either of great Inſincerity, or Ignorance; the firſt of which, I am apt to believe, may moſt juſtly be charg'd upon him; eſpecially if we compare it with the Integrity of the honeſt *Sorboniſt*, who fairly hands the Truth to us from authentick Records, whilſt *Labbe* induſtriouſly conceals it. As to the Apology, and the Acts of the Second Council of *Piſa*, he did very ill conſult Authority, or was very unjuſt, to ſay, that he could not find who was the Author of them; for, as our Biſhop *Barlow* well obſerves, The Second *Piſan* Council was publiſh'd at *Paris* by *Hieronymus de Croaria*, *A. D.* 1514.

Bar-

Barlow de Studio Theolog. Edit. Oxford, A. D. 1700.

These malicious Remarks of the Editors, so unjustly grounded, and so unfaithfully transmitted to Posterity, are sufficient to prejudice the Reader against the truest of their Assertions in other Matters; but when they urge Authority in Defence of their Supremacy, Infallibility, and other modern Topicks, I must confess for my own Part, I shall question their Veracity, unless back'd with very authentick Proof from others.

In the First Session of the *Pisan* Council, the Fathers declare themselves the Representatives of the Universal Church, met together to reform it in Head and Members, declaring all Acts made or attempted by the Pope or any others in Prejudice of the said Council to be in themselves null, and as such to be observ'd by none.

In the Third Session it is decreed, That the Council ought not to be dissolv'd until the Church be reform'd; That a General Council derives its Authority immediately from Christ. That every one, even the Pope himself, is oblig'd to obey the Decrees of a General Council; and that the Council might be remov'd from *Pisa* to *Milan*.

Sess. IV. The Council earnestly desire a Reconciliation with the Pope, and offer him the Choice of a Place where to hold a Council; adding, that if he shall refuse to name it, they would proceed against him. At the same Time entreating him to be tender in the Affair of *Bononia* and *Ferraria*, now the Seat of the War, and to be sparing of the Effusion of Christian Blood, exhorting both the Pope and all Christian Princes to Peace.

Sess. V. They excommunicate all those who shall directly or indirectly molest or disturb the Council, or any one coming to it.

Sess. VI.

Seſſ. VI. Pope *Julius* II. furiouſly driving on his Affairs by Force of Arms, deſpiſes the Sollicitations of the Council: Upon which he is charg'd with Contempt, the calling of the Council ratified, and the Council called by the Pope at *Rome* declar'd void: And the Emperor and King of *France* being threatned with his Holineſs's Anathema's, the Council, in Spirituals, take them into their Protection, and declare all Excommunications, Interdicts, and other Cenſures againſt them, their Subjects and Dominions, to be null; and, if the Pope in Four and twenty Days did not recal his Cenſures and Decrees againſt the Council of *Piſa*, they would proceed to a Declaration of Suſpenſion; which accordingly they did.

For, Seſſ. VII. VIII. Pope *Julius* II. is declar'd, *Conſtant Diſturber, and obſtinate Perſecuter of the Council, notorious Violator and Deſpiſer of its Decrees, a daily Scandal, and ſtubborn Rebel to the Church, Promoter of Schiſm, Diſturber of the Peace, an Incendiary among Chriſtian Princes, blood-thirſty, and a Sower of Diſcord among the People of God: In all which notorious Crimes and Enormities He continuing obſtinate and incorrigible, had incurr'd the Penalty of Suſpenſion, and is,* ipſo facto, *depriv'd of the Papal Adminiſtration: Which Adminiſtration, by reaſon of Defect of Government, and that the Church ſhould not ſuffer thro' a Vacancy, is devolv'd upon the Council, &c. Richer. ibid p.* 287.

Pope *Julius* is not all this while idle, but to ballance this Council with another, calls one at *Rome*, wherein he immediately falls to work with the Fathers of *Piſa*, condemns them of Hereſy, and curſes them heartily. This he did to skreen himſelf from the juſt Reſentment of a Council he had too juſtly provok'd to deal ſeverely with him, who dealt ſo diſingenuouſly and perfidiouſly with them. Beſides, what they threatned him with now, was no more than what had been practis'd againſt ſome of his late Predeceſſors,

who had been forc'd to ſubmit to the Cenſure of a Council, even that of Depoſition. But before we proceed to the *Lateran* Council, which Pope *Julius* call'd in Oppoſition to that of *Piſa*, I ſhall beg Leave to entertain the Reader with *Cabbaſutius*'s Thoughts of theſe Affairs. *Notit. Eccleſ. p.* 568, *&c.* which truly are not a little entertaining, when we conſider how hardly the good Man is put to it, to ſpeak Truth on both Sides. He would fain ſeem to paint this horrid Pope *Julius* in the monſtrous Colours he deſerv'd, but juſtify the Pontificate; which are moſt irreconcileable Inconſiſtencies: For it is too plainly true, that few, if any of the Popes, ever ſtudied the Advancement of the Pontificate but whilſt they were in Poſſeſſion of the Chair; being, whilſt Cardinals, declar'd Enemies to the Pontiff for the Time being: Thus it was between this Pope *Julius* II. whilſt he was only Cardinal *Rovere*, and *Alexander* VI. Ten Years of whoſe Pontificate he was forc'd to reſide in *France*, where he took Sanctuary, to ſecure himſelf from the Treachery and Cruelty of that Monſter, accompanying *Charles* VIII. and *Lewis* XII. Kings of *France*, in their Wars in *Italy*, and aſſiſting them all he could againſt the Sovereign Pontiff. But he no ſooner arrives to this high Poſt in the Church himſelf, then he turns Tail upon his former Principles and Practices, and reduces all within his Reach under his Obedience, but with the Help of the Arms of *France*; for which he afterwards rewards them, as we ſhall quickly ſee. The Character *Cabbaſutius* gives him upon his Advancement to the Chair is ſhort, but very black, *ibid. p.* 567. *col.* 2. *He was* (ſays he) *very powerful in Money and Friends*, [Two neceſſary Qualifications to procure the Papacy] *excellently learned, fierce by Nature, paſſionate, fond of Military Applauſe, bold and bloody. And, that he might not ſeem void of all Vertue*, [ſays my Author very wittily] *he was no Hypocrite.* His Impudence

pudence and Cruelty, which he acted openly and bare-fac'd, in the Sight of the World, may take off the Imputation of Hypocriſy; but when, inſtead of Hypocriſy, a Man ſhall engage notoriouſly in all manner of Barbarity and Villany, tho' he can by Force for a Time maintain himſelf, yet, tho' he is no Hypocrite, I hope none will be ſo immodeſt as to ſay ſuch a Man has any Spark of Vertue in him, eſpecially with the former Character our Author has given him: Which this Pope not only deſerv'd, but a great deal more may be added to it, and from the ſame Author too, which we will take in as it occurs in Series of Time. By the Aſſiſtance of the *French*, he gave the *Venetians* ſuch a Blow, as they ſeldom had before felt; for in the Battle of *Agnadellum* they loſt Ten thouſand Men, their General *Alvianus* ſlain upon the Spot, their Canon, Baggage, *&c.* taken. This was ſo fatal a Stroke, that the *Venetians* were forced to quit their former Acquiſitions on the Continent, and content themſelves within their Covy of Iſlands, called their City of *Venice*. Theſe were good Offices not to be forgotten, and which upon another might have made ſome Impreſſion; but they were thrown away upon good Pope *Julius* II. In ſhort, there was no Town that the Pope had a Mind to, but the *French* Forces ſubdu'd it for him, *viz. Caravaggio*, *Bergomo*, *Cremona*, and ſeveral others. And yet this *Mortalium omnium ingratiſſimus*, *Moſt ungrateful Man*, to uſe *Cabbaſutius*'s Words, forgetful of the League made with King *Lewis*, and the Obligations he had to him, and growing jealous of the Progreſs of the *French* Arms, which he did not know but might ſome Time turn upon him, he underhand, and unknown to the King of *France*, enters into Conſederacy with the *Venetians* to drive the *French* out of *Italy*; at the ſame Time ſending the Biſhop of *Sion* into *Switzerland*, to perſuade the *Swiſs* to break the League they had ſworn

to between the *French* King and them, and to take Pay under him; but the *Swiſs* finding they could not mend themſelves, ſtand firm to the *French*. However, Pope *Julius* gets *Ferdinand* King of *Spain* and *Sicily*, and *Henry* VIII. King of *England*, into his Alliance; and notwithſtanding the Mediation of the Emperor *Maximilian* to reconcile them, the active Pope would not be quiet, but calls to Arms, and, contrary to the Expectation of all Men, beſieges *Ferraria* in the Winter, which the Seaſon of the Year ought to have diſſuaded him from. However, to facilitate this the more, he attacks *Mirandula*, a Town belonging to the *French*, to prevent them from relieving *Ferraria*. Here it is poor *Cabbaſutius* is put to it, for drawing near the Second *Piſan* Council, he is oblig'd to divide his Favour, like *Guiccardine*, between the *French* King and Pope *Julius* II. For as *Guiccardine* blames the King for his *nimiam Religionem*, *Cabbaſutius*, *ib. p.* 568. *col.* 1. ſays, *Ex nimia imprudentique Bonitate peccabat*. And again, *p. ib. col.* 2. he ſays, *At Ludovicus, peſſimo Concilio, &c.* Lewis *very unadviſedly defer'd his March into* Italy *till the next Spring, conſidering what a vigilant and powerful Aggreſſor he had to do with.* And continuing he ſays, *But by worſe Counſel, very unbecoming the Moſt Chriſtian King, and moſt fatal to his Affairs, which leſſen'd the Honour of his Cauſe, and gave his Enemy an Opportunity of juſtifying himſelf, he, in Conſort with the Emperor of* Germany, *by Vertue of their own Authority call a Council, to reduce Pope* Julius, *and chooſe a new Pope. Nothing could happen more fortunately for Pope* Julius *than this, for it not only gave him a more ſpecious Title and Pretence for carrying on the War, but ſtir'd up the People againſt King* Lewis *as an impious ſchiſmatical Enemy of the Church.* But notwithſtanding this, we ſhall find *Cabbaſutius* ſmoothing up all again. The Council, which he ſays was called by the Emperor and King of *France*, he calls the Mock-

Coun-

Council of *Piſa*; which that Pope *Julius* might the more eaſily diſſolve, in Imitation of Pope *Eugene* IV. who, to prevent the Council of *Baſil* falling into a Schiſm, and to check the Power they aſſum'd over the ſupreme See, call'd a Council at *Ferraria*, then at *Florence*; ſo Pope *Julius* II. in Oppoſition to this Second *Piſan* Council, called the *Lateran* Council. But now to make Amends for what *Cabbaſutius* ſaid before of the two great Overſights of King *Lewis*, he commends his Management in the Council of *Tours*, from whom, he ſays, *The King received more wiſe and modeſt Anſwers than from the Aſſembly of* Piſa, *which publiſh'd moſt pernicious Decrees.* The Anſwers which *Cabbaſutius* here calls wiſe and modeſt, are indeed ſo in themſelves; but they are as dogmatical and poſitive againſt the Papal Supremacy, or any other *Romiſh* Encroachment of that Nature, as are any where to be met with. *Vid. ſupra, ad An.* 1503. And having ſet down the Subſtance of theſe Articles, the ſame we have already noted in the Pontificate of *Alexander* VI. at the End he ſubjoins the Opinions of the Hiſtorians of that Age, and who were Eye-Witneſſes of thoſe Tranſactions of King *Lewis* XII. and Pope *Julius* II. in theſe Words: *The beſt* Italian *Hiſtorians of thoſe Times, and who were Witneſſes of what paſſed, very well knew King* Lewis *to be ſo deſirous of Peace, that he omitted nothing that might incline his Holineſs to it. But the more* Lewis *condeſcended, the farther off Pope* Julius *kept, and from* Lewis's *Humility takes Occaſion of inſulting. Ibid. p.* 569. *col.* 2. War being thus reſolv'd on, Pope *Julius* preſſes the Siege of *Mirandula* with all his Might, and encourages his Men with his Preſence, where compleatly arm'd he acts the Parts of General and Engineer, himſelf directing the traverſing of the Artillery, and playing them againſt the Town, which he took by Storm. Going from thence he attack'd *Ferraria*, which prov'd ſo tough a Piece of Work,

that he was forc'd to raiſe the Siege with the Loſs of the greateſt Part of his Army. On the other Side, King *Lewis* diſpoſed the Management of his Affairs in *Italy* in the Hands of his Siſter's Son *Gaſton* Duke *de Foix* of *Nemours*, and a very hopeful young Gentleman; who in a very cold Seaſon, with a freſh Army, paſſes the *Alps*, and comes down into *Italy*. About this Time, Pope *Julius*, with an Army of *Spaniards* and *Italians*, laid Seige to *Bononia*, which the *French* General *Trivultius* had not long before taken from the Pope. But *Gaſton Foix* returning victorious from the Siege of *Breſcia*, opportunely came to the Relief of the Town, which was reduc'd to Extremity. But to return to the *Lateran* Council; in the Proem of which Pope *Julius* declares, That in his younger Years, that is, before he was created Pope, he was clearly for the due Celebration of Councils; but after his Promotion to the Holy See, that Purpoſe and Opinion of his was generally retarded or obſtructed by the frequent Wars amongſt Chriſtian Princes, the reconciling whom took up his Time. Afterwards he adds, that a Hereſy ſuddenly breaking out, (for ſuch he call'd the *Piſan* Council) he was now the more deſirous of calling a Council to extinguiſh that Hereſy. "Wherefore, ſays he, I hope, by the Bleſſing of God, that "all Thorns and Briars will be rooted out of the "Lord's Inheritance, that evil Manners will be amended, that there may be Peace amongſt Chriſtian "Princes, and that all may join in an Expedition "againſt the common Enemy. That they would all "ſet him before their Eyes, *who is the Way, the Truth, "and the Life*, and ſtudy to pleaſe God more than "Men." This is very ſpecious, but no more than what has been commonly uſed by theſe wicked Pilots of the Church, who never intended what they ſaid; which will appear from the Acts of this Council, and will perfectly verify what *Guiccardine* ſaid, *viz.* "That

"in

" in the *Lateran* Council, Pope *Julius* did not in the " leſt intend to perform what he had promis'd, having " no other Thoughts in his turbulent Head than " thoſe of War and Tumult.

In the Front of this Council we have the moſt elegant and polite Speech of *Giles* of *Viterbo*, General of the Order of St. *Auguſtin*; a Piece of Oratory, for its ingenuous honeſt Freedom, beyond what either Pope *Julius* or thoſe Times could bear. The Deſign of this Oration is laid cunningly, and carried on neatly; a fine Air of Devotion appearing through the whole, accompanied with a correptive Smartneſs, (particularly on Pope *Julius*'s warlike Genius) and a truly Chriſtian Tenderneſs and Compaſſion for the Calamity of the Times. There is nothing in the Acts of this Council ſo becoming the Dignity of ſynodical Liberty, and the Neceſſity of celebrating Councils, as this Oration; ſome Paſſages of which, for the Benefit and Entertainment of the Reader, I ſhall excerp. *Con. T.* 14. *p*, 19. *& ſeq.* " Synods, ſays he, " are ſo abſolutely neceſſary to the Subſiſtence of the " Church, that without their Care it cannot be ſup- " ported. They are like refreſhing Showers to the " Meadows, and Springs of Water to Gardens; " like Culture to the Fields, Dreſſing to the Vines, " and Aliment to humane Nature: And whilſt Sy- " nods are neglected, the Church, the Spouſe of " Chriſt, ſeems in a State of Widowhood, in a me- " lancholy Undreſs, like Trees depriv'd of their " Leaves in Winter. Without them the Catholick " Faith cannot ſtand, Chriſtians be ſafe, or the Car- " dinal Vertues, Temperance, Juſtice, *&c.* be main- " tain'd. For ſince we are by Nature prone to turn " Labour into Sloth, and exchange Care for Pleaſure, " we are therefore under a Neceſſity of ſynodical " Cenſure, to correct our Morals and Lives; by " which Means wicked Men are reprov'd and pu-

" nish'd, and the Just cherish'd and incourag'd. " Hence arise those incredible Motives to Vertue, " which teach Men to love one another as Chri- " stians, to think on Things Above, to relinquish " Vice, embrace Vertue, and aim at nothing but " Good in all their Actions. It is this School of all " Vertues that, since the Time of *Constantine the* " *Great*, has produc'd so many glorious Luminaries " of the Church, the *Athanasius's*, the *Basils*, *Na-* " *zianzens*, *Chrysostomes*, *Damascenes*, *Jeromes*, *Am-* " *broses*, *Augustines*, *Gregories*, *&c.* all educated in the " Doctrine of synodical Discipline. What lasting " and inestimable Monuments of Learning and Dis- " cipline have these Blessed Servants of God added " to the Divine Treasury of Christ! After which this excellent Orator handsomely insinuates the Decrees of the Council of *Constance* for the frequent Celebration of General Councils, so formidable to the Court of *Rome*. Then passing to the Military Acts of Pope *Julius*, he slightly varnishes them over, that he may the more deeply affect him: But applying the Stress of his Speech to the Pope himself, he says, " God hath given thee, O *Julius!* an Opportu- " nity beyond all thy Predecessors, that at Home " thou mayst make the Temple the most magnificent " Structure that ever was seen; in War, (which " none could do before thee) make the Arms of the " Church terrible to the most powerful Kings, and " propagate its Empire by the Recovery of *Ariminum*, " *Faventia*, *Ravenna*, and many other Places; which " tho' the Enemy have been able to take from thee, " yet it was not in their Power to hinder thee from " being the First of the *Roman* Pontiffs who ever at- " tempted such Things: For the Valour of great " Princes does not depend on Casualty or Chance, " but on the Wisdom of their Counsels, and Gallan- " try of their Actions." This is a cutting Sarcasm,

which,

which, tho' it ſeems to applaud, yet highly condemns him, as the firſt Pope that acted thus irregularly. And what follows is altogether as reproachful, and plainly charges him with Perjury in theſe Words: " But after all theſe great Actions, two Things were " wanting, *viz.* The calling a Council, and declaring " War againſt the common Enemy of Chriſtianity; " which Things you at firſt promis'd and determin'd, " and now at laſt have perform'd. Therefore God ex- " pects that you ſeriouſly conſider theſe two Things, " and, in Imitation of the Prophet, extirpate Vice " and Error, and plant Truth and Holineſs in their " Room. To the finiſhing of which, nothing hath " ſo much contributed as the Loſs of the Army, " which I eſteem the immediate Act of Providence, " to teach us to depend on the Church, whoſe Arms " are Godlineſs, Prayers and Tears, and whoſe Ar- " mour is the Coat of Mail of Faith, as the Apoſtle " ſays: To which if in a ſynodical Way we return, " we ſhall be ſuperior to our Enemies. Let us con- " ſider the War of *Moſes* with *Amalek*, *Exod.* 17. " and we ſhall find, that ſo long as God's People de- " pended on the Arm of Fleſh, they were always " conquer'd; but when they engag'd in Tears, they " never fail'd of Victory. Whilſt *Moſes*'s Hands " were lifted up, the Army of the Living God pre- " vail'd, but no longer. Theſe were the Arms of " the Church at firſt; by conſtant Application, and " a Series of religious Duties, not by the Temporal " Sword, ſhe ſubdu'd ſo much of *Europe*, *Africa* and " *Aſia*; and whilſt ſhe wore the Robe of Innocence, " becoming the Spouſe of Chriſt, triumph'd ſecurely " every where; but that once exchang'd for Temporal " Arms, ſhe was ſhamefully compell'd to relinquiſh " her former Conqueſts, is her ſelf in a great Meaſure " become a Prey to Infidels, and *Mahomet*'s Banner " daily ſupplants the Croſs of Chriſt. This we have

" ſeen

" ſeen in *Jeruſalem* and *Ægypt*; and the *Byzantine*
" Empire totally ſubdued by their devouring Sword.
" Nor can we expect to eſcape theſe approaching
" Judgments, unleſs we endeavour to avert them
" with our Prayers and Tears. The Storm gathers
" daily over our Heads; our Sins cry for Puniſh-
" ment; and we ſenſibly loſe by our Neglect of re-
" ligious Duties, what our holy Fathers acquired
" with continual Fervency and Devotion. When
" was the Life of Man more ſupine and careleſs of
" Danger? When did Ambition ever more abound?
" When did Impiety more boldly advance againſt
" and encroach upon Religion? And when was
" there ſo great a Neglect of Sacred Truth, and
" Comtempt of the Keys, and holy Commands, *&c.*?"
And then with a moſt preſſing *Epanorthoſis* addreſſing himſelf to Pope *Julius*, he ſays: " Theſe Evils, which
" we daily ſee and feel, are the Call of God, admo-
" niſhing and commanding you to celebrate a Coun-
" cil, to reform the Church, to put an End to theſe
" bloody Wars, to reſtore Peace to your Spouſe, who
" has long wanted it; to avert the Sword hanging
" over this City and all *Italy*, and to reſtrain that
" Licentiouſneſs which has moſt deeply wounded the
" Bowels of the Church. Look down, Bleſſed *Pe-*
" *ter* and *Paul*, ye moſt auguſt Heads and Patrons of
" this City, and ſee in what miſerable Confuſion
" that Church, is which ye eſtabliſhed with your
" Blood! Behold how her Armies are defeated, her
" Fields covered with Heaps of the Slain, her Soil en-
" rich'd with their Blood, and more Forces deſtroy'd
" by inteſtine Wars than would have ſerv'd to repel
" the common Enemy!" I could with infinite Plea-ſure dwell longer on this charming Oration; but the Reader, I hope, will excuſe ſo much as I have already here inſerted, it being chiefly intended to ſhew, that even the moſt modeſt and beſt of the *Romiſh* Au-

thors are not ſparing of ſevere Reprehenſions and ſarcatical Invectives on the Supreme Pontiff, when he ſcandalizes St. *Peter*'s Chair, which none did more than this very Pope *Julius* II. I ſhall now proceed to the Acts of the *Lateran* Council.

Pope *Julius* II. preſided in this Council, the firſt *Seſſion* of which began the 10th of *May*, *A. D.* 1512. and contains the Bull of Indiction of it. In which Bull the Cardinals, who departed from *Rome*, and call'd the *Piſan* Council, are compared to *Lucifer*, *Corah*, *Dathan*, *Abiron*, *Dioſcorus*, *Acacius*, and other Schiſmaticks and Hereticks. *Con. T.* XIV. *p.* 30. *& ſeq.* In the ſame Bull he pretends to examine the Reaſons of the foreſaid Cardinals for their Departure from *Rome*; though 'tis evident beyond all manner of Doubt, that their Safety was their true Reaſon; which they could but ill conſult, whilſt they were within the Power of ſo military a Prelate as Pope *Julius* II. He likewiſe very tenderly touches the Decrees of the Council of *Conſtance*, which juſtify the calling of the Council of *Piſa*: But when he talks of the Oath he took at his Election, of calling a Council within Two Years, he moſt wretchedly and lamely excuſes the Breach of it, urging in his Defence, "That "when he would have corrected thoſe notorious "Crimes that ſcandalized and wounded the Church, "it was objected to him, that the Supreme Pontiff "had nothing to do to call a Council, but that it "did ſecondarily belong to the Cardinals, in caſe of "the Pope's Neglect, to call a Council." This is ridiculouſly falſe both Ways; for in the firſt Place it is undeniable, that Pope *Julius* was upon his Election importuned to call a General Council; which he promiſed to do within Two Years: And, Secondly, he not performing this Oath, the Cardinals do it for him; the Right to do which hath been ſufficiently argued already; as the Apology of the *Piſan* Fathers, and the

the Hiſtory of that Council fairly ſet forth. And here, as *Richerius* obſerves, *Hiſt. Gen. Con. l.* 4. *par.* 2. *p.* 7. it is very much to be wondered, that *Onuphrius*, *Panvinius*, and *Ciaconius*, who wrote the Life of Pope *Julius*, ſhould ſo induſtriouſly leave out this Oath of his; which is a great Fault in Hiſtorians; and it was impoſſible ſo remarkable a Paſſage ſhould eſcape their Knowledge: Which plainly argues them rather Champions of the Court of *Rome*, than of Truth; eſpecially *Ciaconius*; who ſticks not to oppoſe his own fictitious Inventions to the Matters of Fact, of which *Guiccardine* was an Eye-witneſs; with no other Deſign than to excuſe Pope *Julius*, and lay all the Blame on that innocent Prince *Lewis* XII. which we have already diſcuſs'd.

The Second *Seſſion* was opened the ſame Month; which is remarkable for little except the Oration of *Thomas Cajetan*, General of the *Dominicans*, who took for the Theme of his Speech the XXIſt of the *Revelations*, *v.* 2. *I ſaw* (ſays he) *the Holy City, the* New Jeruſalem, *deſcend from Heaven: Which Words*, he ſaid, *cannot be applied to the Council of* Piſa, *which conſiſted only of one Nation, or rather Part of a divided Nation, or indeed of no Nation; for it is no longer holy or lawful than when it recedes from Error, and adheres to Holineſs; from which it ſtill departs further whilſt it ſubjects* Peter *to the Church, and the Pope to a Council; thereby inverting the Courſe of Nature, in ſetting Children above their Parents, the Members above the Head, the Servant above his Lord, &c.* Then he falſely goes on, calling them Aggreſſors in this War; *That this* Piſan *Novelty* (as he ſtiles that Council) *took its Riſe at* Conſtance, *and there vaniſhed: That afterwards it reviv'd at* Baſil, *but was exploded; and that even now, if they would behave themſelves like Men, it ſhould periſh, as it did under Pope* Eugene IV. Then addreſſing himſelf to Pope *Julius*, he blames his Sloth; and, like a diabo-

diabolical Incendiary, ſtimulates this furious Pontiff, too prone of himſelf to Miſchief, with this impious and blaſphemous Motive: *And that you, O holy Father, may, in the firſt Place, imitate the Power, Perfection, and Wiſdom of God himſelf, gird on your Sword, for you have Two, one whereof you enjoy in common with all Temporal Princes, the other is your own Property, ſuch as no Body can have but from your ſelf. With this Sword therefore, which is the Power of the Church, gird thy ſelf, gird it upon thy Thigh, that is, over all the Powers of Mankind, and exerciſe it againſt Error, Hereſy, &c.* Con. T. XIV. p. 68. & ſeq. This is ſpoken with the Spirit of an Incendiary, very unbecoming both the Orator and Perſon addreſs'd to; to enervate which, *Richerius* honeſtly offers his Thoughts in the following Obſervations. *Ibid. p.* 9.

1. As to the Council of *Piſa*'s conſiſting of one Nation, it might more properly be retorted on the *Lateran* Council, which was held at *Rome* under Pope *Julius*, then in Arms, and in which there were ſcarce any but Court-Biſhops, ſuch as depended wholly on the Court of *Rome:* By which Means Pope *Leo* X. who ſucceeded *Julius* II. was enabled to continue this Council ſo long as the Year 1516.

2. Whereas he reflects on the *Piſan* Council for ſubjecting *Peter* to the Church, and the Pope to a Council, thereby inſinuating, That they inverted the Order of Nature, and ſet the Child above the Parent, the Members above the Head, *&c.* He abſurdly ſuppoſes *Peter* and the Pope to be the internal and eſſential Head of the Church, which are but only miniſterial; making no Difference between Chriſt the Lord, and *Peter* the Steward. Certainly the Pope, who is but a Part and Member of the Church, muſt neceſſarily be ſubject to the Church, and a General Council, which repreſents the Church, as a Part is to the whole, the Inſtrument to the Artificer,

the

the Eye to the Man, and the Medium to its End: For which Reaſon, like other Men, he is obliged to ask Abſolution of the Church, and to hold that Article of Faith, *I believe in the Holy Catholick Church, the Communion of Saints, Forgiveneſs of Sins.*

3. It is very unjuſtly charged upon the *Piſan* Fathers, that they ſtirr'd up War againſt the *Roman* Church; whereas it is plain, that *Lewis* XII. who protected this Council, ſuffered many Provocations and Inſults from Pope *Julius*, before he arm'd in his own and their Defence. But it is peculiar to the *Italian* Writers to skreen the Arts of the Court of *Rome* under the Name and Perſon of the Church; for to oppoſe the Court and to oppoſe the Church are Two diſtinct Things, according to *Joannes Major Commentar. in Matthæum, cap.* 18. *A Man may oppoſe the Pope, and yet be within the Church, and in a State of Salvation.*

4. *Cajetan* plainly ſhews with what Spirit he is actuated, when he aſſerts the *Piſan* Council, which he calls Novelty, to take its Original from *Conſtance*, its Recovery from *Baſil*, and its Suppreſſion from Pope *Eugene* IV. *&c.* becauſe the Queſtion was accurately deliberated in thoſe Two Councils, and Pope *Eugene* carried his Point by meer Force. And this is the hopeful Example *Cajetan* propoſes to Pope *Julius*, very unbecoming the paſtoral Office, and the mild Practice of the Law of Grace.

5. In his Claim of the Temporal Sword to the Pope, he indeed ſpeaks Pope *Boniface* VIII.'s Mind, not the Senſe of the Goſpel, which teacheth, that the Power of the Church is purely miniſterially ſpiritual, void of all Dominion, and abſolute Coercion which conſiſts in external Force.

6. His Aſſertion is falſe, where he ſays, that all Biſhops receive the Spiritual Sword from the Pope: For the Holy Scriptures inform us, That the Keys or Power

Power of Juriſdiction was given in common to all the Apoſtles, whoſe Succeſſors Biſhops were. And this *Bellarmine, de Rom. Pont. c.* 23. owns: *Vides*, ait, *idem dari Apoſtolis per illa verba Joannis* 20. *Ego mitto vos*; "You ſee, the ſame was given to the Apoſtles, "by theſe Words of *John, c.* 20. *v.* 21. *I ſend you.*

7. Inſtead of a Peace-maker and good *Samaritan*, he acts the Part of a *Boute-feu*, and is the Trumpet to War and Deſtruction; which he might very well have ſpared, conſidering the warlike Diſpoſition of Pope *Julius*, which wanted no Stimulation. Inſtead of this Inflammatory Incentive, ill becoming the Character of a religious Man and Profeſſor of Divinity, he ſhould for his Imitation have ſet before his Eyes the Example of that good Man *Giles* of *Viterbo*, and have endeavoured to perſuade the turbulent *Julius* to give Peace to the Chriſtian World, and ſtop the Effuſion of its Blood.

The Third Seſſion was held *December* 3. *A. D.* 1512. in which was read the Emperor *Maximilian*'s Letter; wherein he renounces the Councils of *Piſa* and *Tours*, and declares for the *Lateran* Council. But this was not ſo much an Act of his Judgment or Opinion, as his Intereſt, if *Guiccardine* may be believed, who declares the Emperor came over to the *Lateran* Council in hopes of recovering ſome Cities of *Italy*. The ſame Seſſion the whole Kingdom of *France*, except the Dukedom of *Britany*, is put under Interdict, and the Fair of *Lyons* removed by Pope *Julius* to *Geneva*. This muſt be purely to ſhew his Power in Temporal Affairs, for the Act it ſelf has no Relation to Eccleſiaſtical Inſtitution, but is a direct Act of the Court of *Rome*. *Con. T.* 14. *p.* 82.

The Fourth Seſſion was *December* 10. the ſame Year; in which the Edict of *Lewis* XI. King of *France*, for abrogating the *Pragmatick Sanction*, is reviv'd, with a Monitory of Pope *Julius* againſt all Favourers

Favourers and Aſſerters of it, meaning the King and Clergy of *France*, whom he peremptorily cites to renounce the foreſaid *Sanction*, and declare it void.

The Fifth Seſſion was held *February* 16. 1513. in which Cardinal *Riarius* preſided, Pope *Julius* being ſick. Here the Bull againſt Simoniacal Elections of the Popes was read and agreed to by all except Five, ſays *Binius*, in his Notes on this Council and Seſſion, *Con. T.* 14. *p.* 344. This *Richerius* wonders at, *ib. p.* 11. becauſe, ſays he, it was rumour'd that Pope *Julius* himſelf made his Way to the Pontificate by Bribes. Of his Mind is *Guiccardine*, *l.* 6. But it might be the Effect of Repentance; if ſo, 'twas better ſome Way than none, better late than never. *Cabbaſutius*, who is very tender of the Pontificate, and a mighty Champion in Defence of the *Lateran* Council, in Oppoſition to thoſe of *Piſa*, *Conſtance*, and *Baſil*, cannot yet forbear reflecting on the wicked Deſigns and Actions of Pope *Julius* II. *Notit. Eccleſ. p.* 570. where citing *Guiccardine*'s XIth Book, he ſays: *Pope* Julius, *toward the End of his Life, had, in the Name of the Council,* (*viz.* Lateran) *compos'd a Decree, by which the Title of* Moſt Chriſtian *was to be transferred to the King of* England *and his Succeſſors; the King of* France *to be depriv'd of all Royal Dignity, and his Kingdom proſcrib'd. But* (continues he) *God by his Death prevented theſe pernicious Deſigns.* A little further *Cabbaſute* cites *Peter Bembus*'s Twelfth Book of the *Venetian* Hiſtory; whence, to ſhew the implacable Hatred of this Pope to the *French*, he endeavoured, by making a League with the Emperor *Maximilian* and *Venetians*, with their joint Forces, utterly to extirpate that Nation: *Adeo violentis voluntatibus agitabatur*, ſays *Cabbaſutius*, *ib.* And a little before he expired, he adjur'd the Cardinals preſent not to ſuffer his Succeſſor to be choſen by the Council, but by the Conclave. After a troubleſome Reign of Ten Years he reſign'd his Breath; of whom the

Editors ſay nothing; though they ſeldom fail to ſpeak ſomething well of the worſt of their Popes; but here they are ſilent; only *Caranza* in his *Sum. Concil. p.* 883. ſays, *Julius II. Papa moritur bellicâ gloriâ clarus*; a Compliment very unſuitable to the Character of the *Servus Servorum Dei.*

[1513.] Before we proceed to the remaining Seſſions of the *Lateran* Council, we will take in ſomething of the Life of Pope *Leo* X. who was promoted to the Pontificate between the Fifth and Sixth Seſſions of it. He was before call'd *John Medices*, a *Florentine* by Nation, of the famous Family of the *Medices.* Whilſt he was but an Infant, *Lewis* XI. of *France*, out of Reſpect to his Father *Laurence Medices*, beſtowed an Archbiſhoprick on him; and when he was but 13 Years old, Pope *Innocent* VIII. made him a Cardinal. Afterwards the Family of the *Medices* being oppreſſed by *Charles* VIII of *France*, and the *Florentines* in but a low Condition, *John Medices* was forced to quit *Rome*, and travel. About the Year 1503. returning to *Rome*, he was ſoon taken into the Favour of Pope *Julius* II. whoſe Intereſt he purſued to the laſt, and after his Death trod in his Steps. He was firſt made Pope *Julius*'s Legate at *Bononia*, taken Priſoner, *A. D.* 1512. by the *French* at the Battle of *Ravenna*, and being brought to *Milan* at the Time that the Council of *Piſa* had remov'd thither, he was very troubleſome to them. At laſt eſcaping by a Stratagem from the Hands of the *Freneh*, he betook himſelf to his own Province; and *A. D.* 1513. *Ætatis* 37. he is by the junior Cardinals choſen Pope by the Name of *Leo* X. The *Lateran* Council, begun by his Predeceſſor *Julius*, he continued, not only to oppoſe the Council of *Piſa*, but to delay the Reformation of the Church, ſo earneſtly at that Time deſired by all *Chriſtendom.* All Things in this Council obey the Pontifical Nod; and he is ſure to be rewarded

moſt, who can by ſome extraordinary Expedient advance the Grandeur of the Apoſtolick See, and depreſs the Power of Councils.

The Sixth Seſſion began *March* 11. wherein Pope *Leo* himſelf preſided, and little or nothing was done beſides the reading of the *Florentine*'s Mandate for adhering to the Council.

The Seventh *Seſſion* was *June* 17. in which the Mandates of the King of *Poland* and other Princes were read to the ſame Purpoſe; but ſent no Prelates to the Council: Wherefore hitherto this Synod was compos'd of nothing but meer Creatures of the Court of *Rome*. In this Seſſion the *ſafe Conduct*, which the *French* deſired in the Caſe of the *Pragmatick Sanction*, was put off till

The Eighth Seſſion, which was *December* 19. 1513. where firſt is publiſhed the Mandate of King *Lewis* XII. with the Procuration made to Cardinal *Frederic* and others, impowering them to abjure in his Name the *Piſan* Council: For the King upon Pope *Julius*'s Death being deſirous of recovering the Dutchy of *Milan*, and other Lordſhips in *Italy*, endeavours to cultivate a Friendſhip with Pope *Leo* X. Wherefore he impowers his foreſaid Proctors to declare: *That he*, Lewis XII. *never adher'd to the* Piſan *Council with Deſign to make any Deceſſion from the Church of* Rome *and the Apoſtolick See, but only to defend himſelf againſt the Malice and Injuries of Pope* Julius. Therefore the Cauſe of this Difference being buried with him, *he freely and heartily renounc'd the* Piſan *Council, and would adhere to the* Lateran, *as the only, true, and lawful Synod*; *promiſing to ſend ſome Prelates of* France *to it.* In which Declaration, ſays *Richerius*, *ib. p.* 12. we muſt obſerve, That the Pope and the Apoſtolick See were Two diſtinct Things; as were likewiſe the Church and the Court of *Rome*: To juſtify which, he produces the Authority of ſeveral Canoniſts; moſt of

of whom, by the way, were not Men of the honeſteſt Stamp: For let *Richerius*, and an Army of Canoniſts at his Heels, diſtinguiſh ever ſo nicely, they all make *Lewis* XII. but a very Juggler, protecting the *Piſan* Council no longer than it conſiſted with his Intereſt, and renouncing it when he thought it no longer of Uſe to him. This I think his own Words explain, when he ſays, *he adher'd to the* Piſan *Council only to defend himſelf from the Malice and Injuſtice of Pope* Julius. This indeed is not anſwerable to the Character *Richerius* has hitherto given of this Prince; not but ſuch a Diſtinction has been between the Church and the Court of *Rome*, and between the Pope and the Apoſtolick See; for, as has been before allowed, a Man may oppoſe the Pope, and yet be within the Pale of the Church, and in a State of Salvation. However let the Reader judge; it was Matter of Fact, which, without Offence to Truth, I could not omit. Whilſt theſe Things, and others of the like Nature, were carrying on at *Rome*, King *Lewis* XII. pays the laſt Debt to Nature; in whoſe Character *Cabbaſutius*, *p.* 570. *col.* 2. is moſt extravagant: But *Richerius* is more ſincere, *ib. p.* 14. for, firſt begging Pardon for entering into the Secrets of Princes, he tells an honeſt Truth of this excellent Prince, for a Warning to others, tenderly pitying his Weakneſs, without reproaching his Memory. *It was the great Misfortune of that incomparable Prince* Lewis *to be ſo expenſively liberal to Pope* Alexander VI. *and his wicked Family, eſpecially to that Monſter of Mankind,* Cæſar Borgia, *on whom he ſpar'd no Coſt, ſo he might procure his Father Pope* Alexander's *Favour in recovering the Dutchy of* Milan *and Kingdom of* Naples, *at a Time when he ought rather to have promoted the Reformation. Hence we may learn how dangerous the Friendſhip of wicked Men is, and how pernicious their Familiarity is to Chriſtian Princes.*

This Seſſion there were frequent Complaints made to the Pope againſt the ſevere Exactions of the Court of *Rome*; to remedy which, his Holineſs promiſed he would take Care to have them reduced to their primeve Inſtitution; and accordingly orders his Bull upon this Matter to be approv'd in Council; to which ſome conſented, and others not. *Potentinus* was pleaſed with the Bull, but wanted to ſee the Articles of Reformation: Another lik'd the Bull, but not the Reformation, until it were heard and publiſh'd. Others ſaid, they were pleas'd, provided the Reformation were but general. Alas! How different is this from the Practice of the ancient Fathers and Councils, when the State of the Church was Ariſtocratical; for then, duly conſidering and weighing Matters, every one ſingly gave his Opinion, and ſubſcrib'd to the Acts; and when the Votes were caſt up, the Synod made their Concluſion from the Majority. But here the Caſe is alter'd; for the Pope, like an abſolute Monarch in the Church, offers to the Synod what he had in his Cabinet reſolved on, to be without Examination approv'd, and obtain the Force of a Synodical Decree: Which Method Cardinal *Bellarmine* is mightily in love with, *l.* 1. *de Concil. & Eccleſ. c.* 9. and ſays it ought above all to be obſerv'd: And no Wonder truly, ſince this is the only Prop that ſupports the imaginary Infallibility of that abſolute Monarchy.

The Ninth *Seſſion* began *May* 5. 1514. in which is read the King of *Portugal*'s Mandate, declaring his adhering to the Lateran Council: Likewiſe the Procuration of the *Gallican* Prelates, wherein they declare, in the Name of the whole *Gallican* Church and State, of what State or Condition ſoever, that they renounce the *Piſan* Council, (already diſſolv'd) and, in Obedience to the Apoſtolick Mandates, and the Mino-

Monitory of the *French* King, they would adhere to the *Lateran* Council, *&c. Con. T.* 14. *p.* 202. *& ſeq.*

The Tenth *Seſſion* was held *May* 4. 1515. in which, amongſt other Bulls and Edicts, there is one, *ibid. p.* 252. againſt thoſe who pretended themſelves *Exempts*; againſt whom the Pope appoints the Ordinary of the Place to proceed, and to ſend the Proceſs under his Seal to the Court of *Rome*. This is a meer Illuſion of Eccleſiaſtick Juriſdiction, and the moſt certain Way to confirm the abſolute Monarchy of the Pope; for admitting this, Biſhops are no more than the Pope's Proctors and Commiſſaries. But then further this Bull ſays, that theſe Ordinaries ſhall ſend the Proceſſes aforeſaid at the Charge of the *Exempts*. This is putting the Sickle into another's Harveſt, and giving Biſhops Power in Temporal Affairs. But what if theſe *Exempts* ſhould prove Mendicants, or ſuch as have no Temporal Goods, muſt the Biſhops inform at their own Expence? And yet, notwithſtanding the Unreaſonableneſs of this Neceſſity, it was agreed to by the whole Council except the Biſhop of *Trani*, who gave his Reaſons for his Diſſent.

There is in the ſame *Seſſion* a Bull publiſhed about the Printing of Books, *Con. T.* 14. *p.* 257. wherein it is decreed, That no Book be offer'd to the Preſs before it paſs the Cenſure of the Apoſtolick Vicar, or Maſter of the holy Palace; and in other Cities, of the Biſhop of the Dioceſe, or his Vicar; otherwiſe, beſides Confiſcation and Burning of the Books, the Printer ſhall pay an Hundred Ducats towards the Fabrick of the Prince of the Apoſtles. But it may be noted here, that the Pope, as Biſhop and Pope, has no Right to exact pecuniary Mulcts, but only as a political Prince; and therefore his Decrees and Bulls of this Kind are not binding out of the Dominions of the Court of *Rome*. There are many uſeful Ar-

guments urg'd by *Richerius* againſt the Abrogation of the *Pragmatick Sanction*, and the Inſtitution of the *Concordat* between King *Francis* I. and Pope *Leo* X. which for Brevity's Sake I muſt omit, and ſum up the reſt of this Council in ſhort.

Lewis XII. having a little before his Death ſet a fatal Example of renouncing the beſt of his Actions, his Son-in-Law and Succeſſor, *Francis* I. as unhappily imitates him; for as *Lewis* XII. had it in his Power, after the Battle of *Ravenna* and other Advantages, to preſcribe what Laws he pleas'd to the Conquer'd, ſo *Francis* I. at the Battle of *Marignan*, wherein he ſlew 15000 of his Enemies, when he might have compell'd Pope *Leo* and his Confederates to accept what Terms he had pleas'd, inſtead of making a right Uſe of his Victory, is wheedled into a Peace by Pope *Leo*, at the Inducement of his Mother, who had a great Influence over him; for he being not Twenty Years old, was perſuaded by her, that it was impoſſible for the Kingdom of *France* to enjoy any Peace, or him to keep the Dutchy of *Milan*, unleſs he made the Pope and Court of *Rome* his Friends: Which he could never hope for ſo long as he ſuffered the *Pragmatick Sanction*, that is, the Decrees of the Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil*, to prevail in *France*. Beſides which, to tickle the youthful Vanity of this Prince, Pope *Leo* promiſed him the Empire of the World, and would immediately confer upon him the empty Title of Emperor of *Conſtantinople*. Thus *Richerus* out of *Belleforeſt*, and other Writers of thoſe Times. Moreover, to varniſh theſe political Deſigns of Pope *Leo* with a more ſpecious Pretence, King *Francis* is impowered by the Holy See to exact the Tenth of the Clergy's Revenue to carry on the War againſt the Turk. Upon theſe and ſuch-like Motives the King is perſuaded to relinquiſh the *Pragmatick Sanction*; for the Gaining of which, the Court of *Rome* had

near

near an Hundred Years employed all her Arts and Arms both Spiritual and Temporal. In ſhort, the Intereſt of the *Gallican* Church loſt Ground under the Adminiſtration of this young King, by that *Infamous Concordat* which he made with Pope *Leo*, *A. D.* 1515. whereby he obliged the *Gallican* Clergy to renounce the *Piſan* Council, and adhere to the *Lateran*. Tho' in the Year 1517. the *Gallican* Church in the Parliament of *Paris* proteſted againſt it in the Preſence of King *Francis*, and diſapprov'd the Abrogation of the *Pragmatick Sanction*: the Univerſity of *Paris* likewiſe in the ſame Year appeal to a future Council for the Vindication of the Rights of the *Gallican* Church; (*vide Richer. Hiſt. Con. General. l.* 4. *par.* 2. *p.* 30, 44.) and to this Day diſown the *Lateran* Council, and daſh it out of the Number of œcumenical Councils. And to ſhew the Inſincerity of the Editors, (ſome of which were then living, and others who wrote after) they take no Notice of theſe Two Inſtruments, either that of the *Gallican* Church in the Parliament of *Paris*, or the Appeal of the Univerſity: For the Recovery of which we are beholden to the honeſt Sorboniſt *Richerius*, *ibid.* In fine, there were ſcarce Sixty Biſhops preſent at this *Lateran* Council, and moſt of them *Italians*, entire Creatures of the Court of *Rome*, and from whom nothing but what tended to its Advancement could be expected; the Intereſt of the Catholick Church being the leſt of their Care.

And now let us conſider the fatal Conſequences of the Loſs of this *Palladium*, the *Pragmatick Sanction*. Whilſt it was in Force, the Affairs of the *Gallican* Church and Nation ſucceeded proſperouſly: But it was no ſooner abrogated, than an immenſe Swarm of Misfortunes, like thoſe of *Pandora*'s Box, invaded them on all Sides. When thoſe Sacred Elections, propagated by the Apoſtles and Fathers of the Church, in Proceſs of Time began to be neglected in *France*,

that pious Prince *Lewis* IX. (call'd *the Saint*) by his *Pragmatick Sanction*, reviv'd and entirely reſtor'd them: Though the Court of *Rome* was no ſooner remov'd to *Avignon*, but they immediately ſtruck at it, as like to prove a terrible obſtacle to their growing Greatneſs. However, notwithſtanding all their Stratagem and Power, *Charles* VII. about the Year 1422. again recover'd it, and ſtudiouſly ſupported it; for which he fail'd not of his Reward in this World; God Almighty bleſſing his Affairs with ſuch Succeſs, that the *Engliſh* ſtrangely quitted moſt of the Cities and Provinces of *France*, which they had for many Years been poſſeſs'd of: And this not ſo much by Force of Arms, as a ſenſible Diminution of Conduct in that warlike Nation; which otherwiſe is not us'd ſo eaſily to relinquiſh their Hold.

There is an old Legend in *France*, (whether true or falſe is not the Matter, ſince the Fact it portended prov'd true) which ſays, That *Ludoviſia* of *Savoy*, Mother of King *Francis*, having no Children, had a great Veneration for S. *Francis de Paula*; by the Help of whoſe Prayers ſhe obtained a Son; for which Reaſon ſhe call'd his Name *Francis*. This holy Man S. *Francis de Paula*, ſome time before he died, foretold, That this *Francis* of *Valois*, Son to *Ludoviſia*, ſhould be King of *France*: That he ſhould exceed all the Princes of his Age in Glory, Wealth, and Happineſs, provided he applied himſelf ſincerely to the Reformation of the Church; but if he neglected or declined it, he would prove the moſt unfortunate Prince living: Which (whoever was the Prophet) prov'd literally true; for from the Time that King *Francis* revers'd the Decrees of the Council of *Conſtance* and *Baſil*, What Misfortunes, what Calamities did not befal that Prince? It may be conſider'd indeed, that at that Time he was not Twenty Years of Age; and that it was not ſo much his own Inclination

tion as the Inducement and Perſuaſion of others, that prevail'd with him to reverſe the *Pragmatick Sanction*; his Aim being no other than a laſting Peace: However, as laſting and firm a Peace as he expected it to have been, neither he nor any of his Family ever enjoy'd it; and thoſe Signiories in *Italy*, which he was above all Things fond of keeping, he ſoon loſt, and none of his Succeſſors could ever recover. As for Pope *Leo* X. who had betray'd this young King into theſe Inconveniencies, he had no ſooner gain'd his Point in eſtabliſhing the *Concordat* in *France* according to his Mind, but, notwithſtanding his former Promiſes of making *Francis* Emperor, and ſeeming to be juſt about to confer the Title of Emperor of *Conſtantinople* upon him, he ſhamefully relinquiſhes his Intereſt, advances *Charles* King of *Spain* to the Empire, and arms againſt *France*. It may be further obſerved of this unhappy Prince, that though he had many Children and Nephews, to outward Appearance of healthy and ſtrong Conſtitutions, yet from the Date of the *Concordat* they held the Crown of *France* ſcarce Sixty ſix Years, and were taken off in the Flower of their Age. His Son *Francis* the Dauphin was the firſt Inſtance in this Kind of God's Diſpleaſure, being taken off by a poiſon'd Draught, intended againſt the whole Royal Family at the ſame Time, ſo dangerous is it for Chriſtian Princes to turn their Backs upon God, and truſt to their own Councils, and the Arm of Fleſh. As for King *Francis* himſelf, when he was at the Point of Death, being deeply ſenſible of the Weight of God's Judgments, and that he had by his Prevaricating drawn theſe Misfortunes and the Hatred of the Clergy upon himſelf, calls for his Son *Henry*, and with Tears charges him to reſtore the Rights of the Church, and to take Care to ſee them faithfully obſerv'd throughout the whole Kingdom. *Nicolas Gillius*, a Nobleman of *France*, and Hiſtorian of thoſe Times, relates,

relates, That in the Reign of *Francis* I. the Eccleſiaſticks neglecting the Care of their Flocks, and forſaking that Simplicity and Purity of Life which they had before practiſed, turn Court-Sollicitors for larger Preferments, and laying aſide all religious Auſterities, grow in Love with the Luxury of it. This peſtilent Corruption infected all Orders of the Kingdom, and the Subſtance of every Province was exhauſted to ſupply the Extravagance of the Court. Whilſt the *Pragmatick Sanction* was in Force, all Biſhops, Abbots, and other Prelates, kept within their own Diſtricts, and ſpent the Incomes of their Benefices in their own Provinces. The Poor were cheriſhed, holy Edifices repaired, and new Ones erected; but under the unhappy Adminiſtration of King *Francis* all Things were ſacrificed to the Luxury of the Court. And whereas before, according to the Right of Sacred Elections, one Man was intruſted with but one Benefice, now Pluralities, and thoſe incompatible too, are heap'd together to gratify the Wantonneſs of one Man. *Commendams*, that Peſt of Eccleſiaſtick and Monaſtick Diſcipline, and fatal Calamity of the Church's Inheritance, were now confirm'd into a ſolid and perpetual Title. Nor was it the Calamity of the Church only; the ſame Strain of Impiety affected the State; all Places and Promotions in Judicial Courts and otherwiſe are put to Sale. But above all, What a vaſt Extent of Dominion did the *Italians* recover from *France*? Of which, beſides the Graves of their Anceſtors, and ſuch-like Monuments of Miſery, the *French* poſſeſs nothing to this Day: And, what is moſt deplorable, they retain none of the *Italians* Virtues, but their Vices, their ſubtil mercenary Arts.

Eccleſiaſtick Annals afford few Inſtances of any promoted to the Pontifical Dignity ſo young as *Leo* X. he being but Six and thirty Years old. And though he lived the Life of Senſe to the higheſt Degree, denying

nying himſelf nothing that might contribute to his Pleaſure, or gratify his luxurious Humour, a very Atheiſt in Practice, and naturally cruel, yet the Editors in their Account of his Life, *Con. T.* 14. *p.* 364. make him a perfect Saint, calling him Merciful, a Lover of Juſtice and Religion, *&c.* Though their own Hiſtorians, who wrote Matter of Fact, plainly tell us the contrary; particularly *Guiccardine*, *l.* 14. who ſays, " That when *Leo* received the News of " the Defeat of the *French* by the *Spaniards*, and " their Loſs of *Milan*, he expired with Joy." And his avaritious mercenary Temper was ſo notorious at that Time, that *Sannazarius*, an *Italian* Poet, could not forbear throwing this ſarcatical Diſtich at him:

Sacra ſub extrema ſi fortè requiritis hora
Cur Leo non potuit ſumere, vendiderat.

" Pope *Leo* at his Death could not receive
" The Hoſt, for he had ſold it whilſt alive.

But to return to the Thread of our Story. Pope *Leo*, beſides *Ludoviſia* of *Savoy* the King's Mother, had another Inſtrument very uſeful in the debauching young King *Francis* I. and that was *Prata* the Chancellor, by whoſe wicked Council the King was chiefly influenced in the Affair of the *Concordat*, or *Pacta Bononenſia*: By which this mercenary Wretch ſo highly merited of the Pope, that he beſtow'd on him a Cardinal's Hat, and the Office of perpetual Legate in *France*: Of whoſe wicked Management the King was ſoon ſenſible; for *Prata* having laid out a vaſt Sum of Money in repairing and enlarging the Hoſpital of Invalids at *Paris*, which to this Day is call'd the Legate's Court, the King was heard to ſay openly in Preſence, " That though the Legate ſhould ſell " himſelf and all that he had for the Cure and En-

" tertainment of the Poor, he could never make " them Amends." For in robbing the Church, he had robbed the Poor of their beſt Friend. The Inheritance of the Church, as a celeſtial and inexhauſtible Treaſure, conferr'd not on any private Perſon, but entruſted to the Eccleſiaſtick Community, as a Sacred Depoſitum, was faithfully by them diſpens'd, during the Right of Sacred Elections, partly in the Fabrick and Ornaments, and partly for the Support of the Miniſters of the Church and Poor, and other hoſpitable Ends: But when the *Concordat* took Place, the whole Eſtate of the Church was ſacrificed to the Luxury of a few, and the enriching of the Relations of Eccleſiaſticks with Fortunes becoming Secular Princes.

Notwithſtanding Chancellor *Prata* had made his Fortune out of the Ruine of the Church, yet his Grandeur as Cardinal or Legate could not ſcreen him from the Reſentment of the People: The Learned draw their Pens upon him with implacable Fury; the Witty make him the Subject of their Paſquinades; and the very Boys expreſs their Abhorrence of his vile Actions upon him in Effigie. The Scholars of the Academy of *Pleſſe* making a Puppet of Rags, repreſenting Chancellor *Prata*, with the utmoſt Contempt drag him to a Court of their College, where they accuſe and condemn him as a Traitor to the Church, and deliver him to the Mob to be treated with the Ignominy he deſerv'd; which, in the Height of their Reſentment, they would not have fail'd to perform to his real Perſon, if they had had him in their Power. *Vide Genebrard's Chronology.* The ſame Hiſtorian makes Pope *Leo*, the King's Mother, and Chancellor *Prata*, the Authors of the Calamities which from hence befel both Church and State. However it was, that theſe wicked Inſtruments prevail'd

with

with this Prince to comply with their wicked Policies, it is certain that nothing that they propos'd or promis'd him from these Condescensions ever answer'd his Expectations. The heavy Tax of the Tenth upon the Clergy, under Pretence of carrying on the War against the *Turk*, was no more than pouring Water into a Sieve: And as to what they promis'd him, that by this and other Means he would have the Clergy of *France* wholly at his *Devoir*, by the hidden and secret Justice of God the quite contrary happen'd: For it is plain from Experience, that though the Ecclesiasticks (generally speaking) were by the Royal Munificence rais'd to the highest Pitch of Wealth and other Advantages of Fortune, yet they never heartily lov'd King *Francis* and his Family, or any of their Successors; but were entirely in the Interest of the Court of *Rome*: Of which I could name some modern Instances; but —— This was the Ground of those Complaints of King *Francis* I. against *Poncherius*, the last Archbishop of *Paris* that was promoted to that See according to the ancient Right of Sacred Elections; who, siding with the Court of *Rome* against his Prince, gave him much Trouble during the Time of his Captivity in *Spain*, and under-hand oppos'd his Enlargement all he could. The fatal Consequences of these Practices of Ecclesiasticks in Behalf of the Court of *Rome*, in Opposition (I might more properly say, Rebellion) to their own lawful Sovereigns, manifestly shew'd themselves in the civil Tumults under *Henry* III. and after the Murder of *Henry* IV. in the Minority of *Lewis* XIII. It's most demonstrably true from the Practice of all Times, in which the *Pragmatick Sanction* was in Force, that none more bravely maintained and defended the Rights of the *Gallican* Church, the Liberties of the Nation, and the Prerogative

rogative of the King againſt the Uſurpations and Encroachments of the Court of *Rome*, than the Eccleſiaſticks; but when they were let into the Secrets of that Court, they were tainted with Ambition, and ſoon quitted thoſe excellent Principles that had preſerv'd the Church and State independant of the Pontificate. And being thus intoxicated with Pride, Avarice, *&c.* they were ſo far from looking on their Natural Prince as their Liege Lord, that they advance the Supremacy of the *Roman* Pontiff above the Majeſty of *France*, and its King; inſomuch as, *A. D.* 1615, in a Meeting of the Three Eſtates of the Kingdom, they had the Impudence to maintain as a Maxim, That the Pope might depoſe the King of *France*; ſeeming to confound Heaven and Earth together to gain their Point: Which indeed they carried ſo far in Part, that the Order of Nobility clos'd with them in their factious Opinion. By theſe impious Doctrines, Subjects were taught to rebel againſt their lawful Kings, who are now become but ſo many Tributaries to the Deſpotick Abſolute Monarchy of the Biſhop of *Rome*.

The Univerſity of *Paris* having appointed a Time for inquiring into and hearing the Grievances and Calamities which the *Concordat* had occaſioned, Maſter *John Bochard*, Syndic or Advocate of all the Univerſities of *France*, was appointed to open the Cauſe: And it being the Cuſtom for him that was to plead any Cauſe, to take ſome Text of Scripture for the Principle of his Speech; when he endeavoured to demonſtrate how earneſtly all the Univerſities of *France* deſired to be Sharers of the mournful State of the Church, and how all good Men deplored her calamitous Condition, he began with this Text, *With Deſire I have deſired to eat this Paſſover with you.* Then reckoning up the many Ar-

Arguments againſt, and Inconveniencies of the *Concordat*, he plainly demonſtrates the Nullity of it; that it was carried by a high Hand, contrary to all Law or rightful Order; and that being finiſh'd and ſign'd the ſame Day with the Abrogation of the *Pragmatick Sanction*, it was plain the Court of *Rome* was reſolv'd by Force to abrogate the Right of Sacred Elections, and not allow the *Gallican* Church any previous Examination of the Matter. But this honeſt Orator might as well have been ſilent, for he had no ſooner ended his Speech, but he is committed to ſafe Cuſtody. It was not only the Opinion of *Richerius*, *ib. p.* 58. but of very many good and learned Men, that the Abrogation of theſe Bulwarks and Mounds of the Church, was the deepeſt Stab ſhe ever received, worſe than any Thing that *Luther* or *Calvin* were capable of doing. As for *Richerius*'s Opinion of *Martin Luther* and *John Calvin*, it was the ſame with thoſe who wrote for a Reformation in the Practice and Morals of Churchmen, but were ſtill for retaining ſeveral erroneous Doctrines, ſuch as Tranſubſtantiation, Invocation of Saints, *&c.* Undoubtedly had they reform'd without Sacrilege, and reviv'd the ancient Method of Church-Government without a total Subverſion of Diſcipline, the Church would ſoon have put on her Primitive Purity, and all Things have moved in their proper Spheres; but now being diveſted of thoſe Fortifications, which were her ſole Defence, Inundations of Irregularities and Enormities flow in upon her, and ſhe is, like a City taken by an Enemy, ſtrip'd of all Power and Diſcipline. "Hence, ſays *Genebrard*, proceeded the Ruine of "*France* (tho' we may rather ſay of the whole "Church); hence the many Hereſies, Simonies, "Commendams, Fiduciaries, and other mercenary "Arts; hence an Extirpation of Learning, Vir-

"tue,

" tue and Piety, and a *Babyloniſh* Confuſion in the " Main :" Which ſoon put an End to the Apoſtolick Diſcipline, depriv'd the Church of that common Right and ordinary Miſſion inſtituted by God, diſpens'd with the Reſidence of Paſtors, which is of Divine and Natural Right, and in fine hath let a general Corruption into the Hierarchy, and done an unſpeakable Dammage to Chriſtianity. The End to which all this tends is, that the Biſhop of *Rome* is Supreme and Infallible, that either as a Pope or private Perſon he cannot Err. Thus *Bellarmine, l.* 4. *de Rom. Pontiff. cap.* 6. *Item Papam neque in Approbatione Religioſorum, neque in Canonizatione Sanctorum errare poſſe.* Thus to confirm this Infallibility in the Pope, have they trampled upon the whole State of the Church as it was inſtituted by Chriſt and his Apoſtles ; and leaſt any one ſhould be ſo hardy as to gainſay or oppoſe this Heterodoxy, they declare him an Heretick and Schiſmatick that ſhall dare to imagine any Thing to the contrary. But alas ! what poor Security can earthly Politicks give to ſuch impious Actions ? The Wolf cannot conceal his Voracity in the Sheep's Cloathing ; and the Butcher does but awkardly act the Shepherd. And therefore, notwithſtanding all the Artifice humane Nature could invent to skreen their wicked Practices from the World, that People might not know that Emendation was abſolutely wanted in the Church, and that tho' all good Men, for above Two hundred Years, had earneſtly ſollicited for a Reformation, yet nothing was done towards it ; at laſt the Almighty, through his wonderful and unſearchable Providence, brought all Things to Light, and expoſed them to the View of all Men. For the very ſame Year that the Decrees of the Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil*, together with the *Pragmatick Sanction*, were by Pope *Leo* X. abrogated in

the *Lateran* Council, *Luther* preach'd againſt that ſcandalous Practice of getting Money by Indulgences. This was one of Pope *Leo*'s Projects to fill his Treaſury; for employing *Tezellius*, a *Dominican* Monk in *Germany*, and others in other Parts, to preach up the Benefit of Indulgences, they acquir'd immenſe Sums of Money by it; which theſe Eccleſiaſtick Huckſters carried on with a moſt unparallel'd Impudence, perſwading the People, that by Vertue of theſe Indulgences, not only the Living, but the Dead were abſolved from all Sin and Puniſhment, and were in an immediate State of Salvation. *Cav. Hiſt. Lit. Par.* 2. *p.* 205. *Luther* attacks them with no leſs Succeſs than Bravery, inſomuch that *Tezellius* and his Companions charge *Luther* with Hereſy, and threaten him with the Faggot. But *Luther* finding himſelf able to maintain his Arguments, offers his Adverſaries to refer the Matter in Debate between them to the Biſhop of the Dioceſs, and the Provincial of his own Order, or to the Cenſure of Pope *Leo*. In the mean Time *Luther* is aſſaulted from all Quarters, the great *Diana* lying now at Stake; and therefore *Eckius*, *Prierias*, *Hockſtratus*, and others, not only revile him, but adviſe the Pope to have him burnt. This rous'd *Luther*, who was naturally warm, and impatient of Injuries; and ſitting hard to his Study, he made it his Buſineſs to diſcover all the Fallacies and Errors of the Church of *Rome*, which he failed not to let the World know; for the more they threatned him, the more he grew incens'd; and when Cardinal *Cajetan*, the Apoſtolick Legate, had ſummon'd and commanded him to renounce his Opinion, he told him he did not through Obſtinacy maintain or aſſert any Thing; but what the Holy Scriptures taught him he would obſerve, being ready in all Things to abide by the Judgment of the Church,

for which he appeals to the Pope, and at laſt from the Pope to a General Council. During all which Time he was not idle, for making daily Diſcoveries of the wicked Morals of Eccleſiaſticks and their erroneous Principles, he at laſt falls foul on the Pope's Supremacy, Purgatory, Indulgences, *&c.* in the Diſpute between him and *Eckius*; which at once put all *Europe* in a Flame. To quench which,

[1522.] Pope *Adrian* VI. (a Man of much Piety and Goodneſs, (and who would not, like his Predeceſſors, change his Name) ſends Inſtructions to *Cheregate*, his Legate, to propoſe to the Princes of *Germany*, in the Aſſembly at *Nuremburg*, ſome Expedients for the Reformation of the Church, which was abſolutely neceſſary at this Time. In which the *German* Princes readily concur with his Holineſs; and, if we may believe *Ciaconius*, who wrote the Life of this Pope, he certainly intended to call a General Council for the Reformation of the Church, if God had pleaſed to ſpare his Life. For, reflecting upon the Practices of the Court of *Rome*, he was often heard to ſay to his two Favourites *Encurtius* and *Hezius*, "The Biſhops of *Rome* had a "very hard Task of it; for Matters were come to "that Paſs now, that tho' the Church extremely "wanted Reforming, and he moſt deſirous of it, "yet it could not be done; ſince the Corruptions "and Abuſes were confirm'd into a Sort of a Law "by long Practice." But however juſt and piouſly inclin'd Pope *Adrian* might have been,

[1523.] *Clement* VII. his Succeſſor, and who reviv'd the old Cuſtom of changing Names, (he being before called *Julian* of *Medicis*) is of a different Opinion to his Predeceſſor, and would uſually expreſs himſelf a contrary Way, ſaying, "That "as in the firſt Ages of the Church the frequent

"Ce-

" Celebration of Councils added freſh Power to " the Pontifical Authority: So in theſe latter " Times Councils diminiſh'd its Majeſty: For " which Reaſon modern Popes made it their Buſi- " neſs as much to decline the calling them, as for- " mer Popes did to procure them." And upon this Maxim *Clement* VII. during his Pontificate, which laſted near Eleven Years, as induſtriouſly avoided calling a General Council, as the whole Chriſtian World earneſtly deſired it: Which, tho' it made his Reign very troubleſome to his Neighbours, gave *Luther* and others a favourable Opportunity of propagating the Reformation. But this was the Opinion but of One Pope: His Succeſſor, [1534.] *Paul* III. (before called *Alexander*) thinks otherwiſe; for ſeeing *Lutheraniſm* (as they call it) daily get Ground, and Complaints againſt the Court of *Rome* increaſe from all Quarters, notwithſtanding the Practice of Modern Popes, he finds himſelf under a Neceſſity of reforming both the *Roman* Church and Court, which he publickly notify'd. In Order to which he commiſſions a Council of Nine, (whereof Four were Cardinals, the other Five Biſhops or other Prelates) to draw up Articles to ſhew the Neceſſity of a Reformation. The chief of which are:

1. The Abuſe of Ordinations, in ordaining illiterate, mean and immoral Perſons to the Prieſthood, and very often Children to that Sacred Character.

2. The unjuſt Collation of Benefices, even of Biſhopricks, on ſuch who, by reaſon of uncanonical Diſtance, could not execute the Paſtoral Care required.

3. The mean Penſions allow'd by Perſons benefic'd.

4. Simoniacal Commutations of Benefices for Lucre's Sake.

5. The Abuſe of robbing the Church of its Goods, by Bequeathment, which no Teſtator has Right to do, *&c.*

6. Promiſe or Reſervation of Benefices before a Vacancy; whereby the Death of the Incumbent is wiſh'd for.

7. Pluralities of Cures, eſpecially Biſhopricks.

8. The Incompatibility of Cardinalſhip and Epiſcopacy, the Office of the latter being to attend his Flock.

9. The Abſence of Cardinals from the Court of *Rome*, where their Attendance is required.

10. The Irregularities of Religious Orders.

11. The Abuſes of Monaſteries for Women, ſubject to the Convents, and not to their proper Biſhops.

12. Profane and vain Diſputes of Philoſophy n Publick Schools, with ſeveral others.

The Proem to theſe Articles would fain ſeem to ſupport the Supremacy of the Pope in this Neceſſity of Reforming, tho' it is the very Source and Root of all theſe Abuſes; and tho' in their particular Addreſs to the Pope, in the very Words of St. *Paul*, they call him *Diſpenſator*, or Steward; not *Dominus*, or Lord. *Richer. l.* 4. *Par.* 2. *p.* 72. Yet in the next Page they uſe this nice Diſtinction, *The Office of the Univerſal Biſhop, and that of the Biſhop of* Rome. Not conſidering what they afterwards aſſert in the Article of the Incompatibility of Biſhops and Cardinals; wherein they ſay, *It is to no Purpoſe to correct the Abuſes of others, if they do not reform in the chief Members. ibid. p.* 76. in which Number it's to be hop'd they include the Biſhop of *Rome*, or elſe they exclude him from being a Member of the Church.

Where-

Whereas, by the Acts of the Councils of the Primitive Church, we find it was the Practice of the Fathers to give an Account not only of what preceded, but follow'd thoſe Councils (of which the Firſt Council of *Epheſus*, *Chalcedon*, *&c.* give undeniable Proof). *Richerius*, *ib p.* 71. deplores, that in an Age wherein the Art of Printing flouriſh'd, all the Acts of the Council of *Trent* were not faithfully publiſh'd. The Occaſion and Foundation of which Council were the *Commentarii Fiduciæ* of Pope *Adrian* VI. to *Cheregate* the Apoſtolick Nuncio in *Germany*, and the Articles of the Council of Nine by Order of Pope *Paul* III. Which was the Motive for *Peter Crabb* the *Franciſcan*'s prefixing the Articles of the Council of Nine to the Council of *Trent* in his Collection of the Councils. He likewiſe, *ibid.* wonders that *Surius* the *Carthuſian* ſhould leave them out, but is not in the leſt ſurpriz'd at *Binius* for doing ſo, becauſe he declares he copies after *Bellarmine* and *Baronius*, who were obſtinate Aſſerters of the Temporal Monarchy of the Court of *Rome*, and abrogate and expunge all that make againſt it. Nor is it leſs to be admired *Labbe* and *Coſſart*, in their 14th Tome of the Councils, ſhould take no Notice of the foreſaid Articles of the Council of Nine, beginning the Council of *Trent* with the Bull of Indiction, and proceeding immediately to the Firſt Seſſion of it. *Con. T.* 14. *p.* 725, 732.

The Council of *Trent* hath been treated of by many learned Pens already; I ſhall therefore, to cloſe this Work, only take Notice of ſome Obſervations of the honeſt Sorboniſt *Richerius* upon it, and ſo take my Leave.

[1545.] After many tedious Delays, and the longing Expectation of the Chriſtian World, at the preſſing Inſtances of the Emperor *Charles* V. and

Francis I. the Council of *Trent* began, *A. D.* 1545. under *Paul* III. during whoſe Pontificate Ten Seſſions were held. Afterwards, *A. D.* 1551. under Pope *Julius* III. there were Six Seſſions more held; tho' Pope *Julius* for two Years diſcontinued the Council; againſt the Unreaſonableneſs of which Suſpenſion the *Spaniſh* Biſhops were not a little exclamatory. At laſt, *A. D.* 1562. under Pope *Pius* IV. the Nine laſt Seſſions were held, and the Year following the Council was concluded. Certainly from *Conſtantine the Great* to this Time, nothing was more ſincerely aim'd at, and deſired by the whole Chriſtian World than a Reformation: But the Method of proceeding plainly ſhews, That the Court of *Rome* meant no ſuch Thing; but rather, upon the Ruine of the Church, to eſtabliſh their Supremacy. This is evident from all the Champions of the Pontificate, particularly *Bellarmine, de Concil. & Eccleſ. cap.* 9. toward the End; namely, that it was not lawful for any one to offer any Thing in Oppoſition to the Propoſition made by the Pope's Legates: Which are the very Words of the 17th Seſſion, *Con. T.* 14. *p.* 840. *Placetne Concilium celebrari, &c. & in eo ea debito ſervato Ordine tractari, quæ PROPONENTIBUS LEGATIS, ad horum Temporum levandas Calamitates ſanctæ Synodo apta videbuntur.* The Cardinals who, as Legates of the Apoſtolick See, preſided in this Council of *Trent*, were, *Joannes Maria de Monte, Marcellus Cervinus*, and *Reginald Pool*; to whom only it was permitted to propoſe or offer any Thing in Council; and this was under Pretence of avoiding Confuſion and Diſorder, tho' in very Truth it was for no other End than to obſtruct the Reformation of both Church and Court of *Rome*. But *Bellarmine*, from the Place before cited, will have the Pope, as ſole, abſolute, and infallible Monarch, have the

Power of making and preſcribing Laws by himſelf and Cabinet, and then have them approv'd only in Council. And, *l.* 2. *c.* 11. *ejuſdem*, he ſays, " The " Pope's Legates were ſent to the Council of *Trent* " without Inſtructions, becauſe there was ſuch " Variety of Matter to be treated of, that it was " impoſſible for them to be inſtructed rightly. Whence *Bellarmine* would infer, That the *Trentine* Fathers, after they had deliver'd their Opinions of Matters propoſed in Council, ſent to *Rome* to obtain the Influence or Inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt for an Infallible Determination. *Vallius*, *de Suprem. Poteſt. Papæ*, *Par.* 4. *Quæſt.* 6. is of the ſame Opinion: Yet both he and *Bellarmine* cannot come off clear in this, tho' they would ſeem to ſtifle and enervate the Rumours which, during the Sitting of this Council, ſpread every where, *viz.* " That the " Holy Ghoſt was evok'd from *Rome* by the *Trentine* " Fathers, and ſent from thence to the Council. But let the Friends of the Pontificate expreſs themſelves how they will or can, whether the Apoſtolick Legates went with or without Inſtructions, and whether they were arbitrarily to carry their Point, or wait for a favourable Opportunity; it is plain from Matter of Fact, the Management of the Pontifical Party, and the Conſequences, that *Abſolute Monarchy* was the ultimate End of this Council; and to perſuade the World, that Chriſt beſtow'd or tranſmitted the Bleſſed Influences of his Spirit on the Church by he Pope alone. Which is very repugnant to the Rules laid down by our Saviour, and the Practice of the Primitive Church for the Firſt Eight General Councils. For our Bleſſed Lord, *Mat.* 18. *v.* 17, 18, 19, 20. does not confine His and the Holy Ghoſt's Preſence and Aſſiſtance to one ſingle Perſon, Place, or See; but to the Church aſſembled in his Name. " If he will not

" hear them, tell it unto the Church, *&c.* What-
" ſoever Ye ſhall bind, *&c.* [Not Thou, O Pope!]
" Again, If Two of you ſhall agree in Earth up-
" on any Thing, whatſoever they ſhall deſire it
" ſhall be given them of my Father; and laſtly,
" Where Two or Three ſhall be gathered together
" in my Name, I am there in the Midſt of them.

All which Texts plainly imply, That the Holy Ghoſt is beſtow'd on the Church diffuſive, and not confin'd to the ſingle Perſon and Diſpenſation of one Man. And this is evident from the Practice of the Apoſtles themſelves, in the Method of holding Councils, which were not aſſembled by the ſpecial Mandate of St. *Peter*, but by the joint Conſent of the Apoſtles; who, as to the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt, had an equal Share with him. And therefore 'tis plain, that the *Trentine* Fathers canonically aſſembled had no Occaſion to ſend to *Rome* for the Illumination of the Holy Spirit to enable them to an Infallible Determination; when by Vertue of the Promiſes of Chriſt they were entitled to as great Illumination of Spirit as the Biſhop of *Rome* was. But we need not wonder at this new and unheard-of Manner of Proceeding introduc'd by the *Trentine* Fathers, if we conſider the Diſuſe of Councils, and the Encroachment of the Pontifical Abſolute Monarchy over the natural Rights and Laws of the Ariſtocratical Government in the Church. And truly the State of Epiſcopacy was at this Time in *Italy* ſo ſubjugated to the arbitrary Will of the Biſhop of *Rome*, and had ſo entire a Dependance on that See, that they dare not attempt the Recovery of that Ariſtocracy which alone would ſet them at Liberty. This Opportunity therefore the *Roman* Pontiff lays hold on, and ſince the World are ſo fond of a Council, they ſhall have one; but it ſhall conſiſt of ſuch a Majority

jority as ſhall not anſwer their Ends; there being triple the Number of *Italian* Biſhops to thoſe of other Provinces; as is plain from the Editions of this Council: For out of *Italy* alone there were an Hundred eighty ſeven, and out of all other Provinces and Nations only Eighty one Biſhops were preſent at it. *Con. T.* 14. *p.* 938. Therefore we may very well ſuppoſe, that the *Italian* Biſhops, who had their ſole Dependance, as Subjects, on the Court of *Rome*, would do nothing derogatory to its Intereſt. And that the Strength of the Eccleſiaſtick Monarch conſiſted in Subjects of this Kind, we have ſufficient Proof from their own Hiſtorians. *John Baptiſt Adriani*, a *Florentine*, who continued *Guiccardine*, and was Privy Counſellor to the Great Duke of *Hetruria*, declares, that *A. D.* 1562. Pope *Pius* IV. was hardly perſuaded by his Kinſman the Duke of *Hetruria* to call a Council; but at laſt being convinc'd by the Duke's Reaſons, or rather the continual repeated Sollicitations of all Chriſtian Princes, (which put him under a Sort of Neceſſity) he conſents to call a Council: But to prevent any Contradiction to his Grandeur, or Check to his Supremacy, he commands all the Biſhops of *Italy* to be preſent, that whatever Matter ſhould be ſtarted, he might have a Majority to vote in his Favour. *Claudius Eſpenſæus*, who was preſent at the Council of *Trent*, *in Comment. in Epiſtolam ad Titum*, complains againſt the Manner of proceeding in it, ſaying, That the *Italian* Biſhops out-numbring the Biſhops of all other Nations, it was in vain to expect free Synods, or a Reformation. Certainly, if the Acts of this Council (which muſt be induſtriouſly concealed or deſtroy'd) were to appear, they would diſcover many Secrets of the Court of *Rome*.

The Two General Points debated in this Council were theſe; 1. Doctrinal, or relating to Faith. 2. Political. In the Firſt, not only the *Romaniſts*, but other Parts of the Church of *Rome* agree; tho' in the Second they differ, particularly in thoſe new Conſtitutions which the Court of *Rome* had for its own private Advantage extorted. The Fathers of the Firſt Eight General Councils preſerv'd the common Right of Epiſcopacy and its Ariſtocratical Regimen, which, as truly Apoſtolical, they endeavoured to tranſmit to Poſterity. But the *Italian* Biſhops run quite *contra* to theſe Principles, and with all their Art and Strength aſſert the Empire of the *Roman* Pontiff over all Eccleſiaſtick Affairs. According to the Cuſtom of the Primitive Church, every Biſhop was to govern his Dioceſs conformably to the Fifth Canon of the Council of *Nice*; and that every one was to be ſubject to the Biſhop of the Dioceſs within whoſe Diſtrict he liv'd. But in the Council of *Trent* new, till now, unheard of Methods are invented, by which the Biſhop of *Rome*, as Abſolute Monarch, governs the Univerſal Church by the Biſhops, who are but his *Proctors, Commiſſaries and Delegates.* This is evident from XXII. Seſſ. cap. 5, 6, 8, and XXV. Seſſ. cap. 9. in which the Biſhops are called but *Apoſtolicæ Sedis Delegati. Con. T.* 14. *p.* 859, 900. and act but by Vertue of a Deputation from the Court of *Rome.* But ſince Biſhops, equally with the Pope, derive their Authority immediately from God; and that he is above them in no Degree but that of Primacy, as being Firſt Biſhop, and Patriarch of the *Weſtern* Church, certainly they can by no humane Right be deprived of that Power which they derive immediately from God.

There is one Thing worth obſerving of the *Trentine* Fathers, who, according to the Practice of the Court

Court of *Rome*, exact Temporal Puniſhments and Pecuniary Mulcts, as if our Bleſſed Lord had committed the Care of Secular Affairs to his Church. Nor do they enjoin theſe Mulcts and Puniſhments as a penitentiary Sentence, but as the Act of a Political Prince. And yet, ſuppoſing all this, theſe Penalties ought only to oblige thoſe who are Temporal Subjects of the Pope, on the Account of St. *Peter*'s Patrimony, (which was the Gift of *Pipin* and *Charlemain*) and not as Temporal Mulcts affect the Subjects of other Princes. But the *Italian* Fathers of this Council having aſſum'd thus much of the Civil Power, we muſt not wonder to ſee them graſp more of it. In Seſſ. 25. c. 3. they empower Biſhops to impriſon and inflict corporal Puniſhments. *Con. T. ib. p.* 907. And the ſame Seſſion, *cap.* 19. *ib. p.* 916. That Temporal Lord, in whoſe City, Land, *&c.* a Duel is fought, ſhall forfeit his Right.

We will now take a View of thoſe Decrees which regard the Reformation of Morals and Eccleſiaſtick Diſcipline; and which the Chriſtian World for above Two hundred Years had impatiently deſired. But alas! Inſtead of that genuine and ſolid Emendation of the vile Corruptions they had ſo long laboured under, they are ſhamm'd with an imaginary ſubventaneous Reformation. For in Seſſ. VII. *in Decret. Reformationis, Con. T.* 14. *p.* 799. the Hopes of Reformation are daſh'd in the Proem of the Decree in theſe Words, *Eadem ſacroſancta Synodus, &c.* "The ſame Holy Synod intending to "proſecute the Buſineſs of Reformation, hath de-"creed as follows, *Salvâ ſemper in omnibus Apoſto-"licæ Sedis Auctoritate*, ſaving the Power of the "Apoſtolick See. The ſame Thing is expreſs'd in XXV. Seſſ. *cap.* 21. *ibid. p.* 917. which amounts to this, That they would reform in every Thing,

but

but in what they ought, excepting the Head, which was the Part moſt grieved. It was originally the Practice of the Church to ſecure its Polity, and to make her Rules of Government firm and immovable; and all Biſhops, even He of *Rome*, oblig'd by Canons. By theſe Proceedings it's plain, the Biſhops of *Italy* were reſolv'd to ſecure the Court of *Rome*, by checking the Reformation; which upon Enquiry would have diſcover'd very foul Deformities. Beſides, it's plain from the frequent Currency of the Couriers, during the Sitting of this Council, from *Rome* to *Trent*, that the Buſineſs was not ſo much to implore the Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt from thence, as to bring Intelligence of Matters tranſacted, and remit Inſtructions how to manage for the Intereſt of the Court. But to perſue the Hiſtory of this Council, they gloſs over their crafty Deſigns with the moſt ſpecious Pretence of the Practice of the moſt ancient Councils, *viz.* that of the Reſidence of Paſtors in their proper Diſtricts, in Oppoſition to Pluralities. *Con. T.* 14. *p.* 780. *cap.* 2. "No Perſon, of what Dignity, "Degree, *&c.* ſoever, ſhall hold more than one "Metropolitan or Cathedral Church in Title or "Commendam. But ſuch as ſhould, contrary to "the Tenor of this Decree, hold more than one "Church, (if they were within the Diſpenſation "of the Apoſtolick See) ſhould relinquiſh all but "the laſt within Six Months." This indeed is an excellent and wholeſome Decree, if it were not for the *Salvâ Sedis Apoſtolicæ* in the Proem to this Decree of Reformation; and, which is cunningly inſinuated in the Second Chapter by Way of Apoſtolick Diſpenſation. This the foreſaid *Eſpenſæus*, who with *Petrus Daneſius* Biſhop of *la Vour*, and Embaſſador of King *Francis* I. attended at the Council of *Trent*, further explains; for this Decree againſt holding

holding Pluralities was no ſooner publiſh'd, but Pope *Paul* III. ſets forth a Decree to the ſame Purpoſe. Upon which Decree *Eſpenſæus* differts in his Commentary *in Epiſtolam ad Titum de* αἰσχροκερδείᾳ, or *Filthy Lucre*, in theſe Words, " *Paul* III. did not " in this acquieſce with the Council of Nine, *(be-* " *fore-mentioned)* ſince in the Second Chapter of " the 7th Seſſion of the Council of *Trent*, there was " Care taken againſt Pluralities, he cuts off all " with the *Salvâ ſemper in omnibus Sedis Apoſtolicæ* " *Auctoritate.* Which was indeed doing nothing at all: For, as the ſame Author goes on, " The " ſame Pope *Paul* reſerves the Profits, *(viz.* of the " relinquiſh'd Benefices*)* to himſelf, only aſſigning " a Subſiſtence for the Maintenance of the Dig- " nity. Which is quite contrary to the Intent of " the Council of Nine: For the Benefice, that is, " the Income, is as naturally annex'd to the Office, " as the Body to the Soul, one of which cannot ſub- " ſiſt without the other; and conſequently he that " bears the Character ought to enjoy the Benefice. This may be depended on as Truth, *Eſpenſæus* being Witneſs of the Matter of Fact; and, who having ſeen ſo much Trifling in the Caſe of Reformation in this Council, tho' earneſtly importun'd by Cardinal *Lotheranus*, could not be perſuaded to go to the Council in the Year 1562. truly preſaging, that they were not ſincere in the Affair of Reformation. Which *Claudius Sanctius*, his Brother Sorboniſt, (who accompanied the Cardinal to the Council of *Trent* that Year) affectionately congratulates him for. " You never were more fortunate than in " not coming hither. For had you ſeen the vile " Practices here to check the Reformation, it " would have broken your Heart. The *French* " were more ſincere and induſtrious in it than " others, who now laugh at us for the Misfortunes

" *France*

" *France* labours under, as if the Civil Wars were a " juſt Judgment on her. We arriv'd here when " the Argument in Hand was about Holy Orders. " [This was in the Year 1563.] The *Spaniſh* Bi- " ſhops ſollicited earneſtly, that the Synod would " declare Epiſcopacy an Inſtitution of Chriſt; " and that Biſhops were by Divine Right ſuperior " to Prieſts. In which the *French* heartily concur'd " with them. But to prevent the Conſequence of " this honeſt Propoſition, the *Italians* propoſe and " carry ſeveral Canons in Favour of the Pope, in " Oppoſition to what the *Spaniſh* Biſhops urg'd; " by which they pretend the Pope to be the Bi- " ſhop immediately ordained of Chriſt, and that " all other Biſhops have no Power but what is de- " pendant of the Power of the Pope, or of the " Pope himſelf. It is impoſſible for me to tell you " particularly what I have ſeen and heard in " this Council. I wiſh, tho' at the Peril of my " Life, I were in the *Sorbon*. *Trent, June* 15. 1563. By that little Light *Sanctius* gives us in this ſhort Epiſtle, it's plain with what a high Hand Matters were carried in Favour of the Court of *Rome*; and how inſincere the Editors are in concealing the Acts of this Council; for undoubtedly *Labbé* and *Coſſart* had the ſame Opportunity that *Richerius* had of publiſhing, tho' but ſo ſmall a Monument as this Epiſtle of *Sanctius* to *Eſpenſæus*. But they take not the leſt Notice of the honeſt Efforts of the *Spaniſh* or *French* Biſhops in this great Affair of Epiſcopacy; but go on with the Buſineſs of the Canons, wherein they never fail to inſert any Thing that makes for the Power and Intereſt of the Court of *Rome*.

Before we part with ſo reputable and neceſſary an Evidence and Eye-Witneſs of ſome of the Abuſes of this Council in Relation to the Reformation;

tion; and who to the laſt would not drop the leſt of his Reſentment againſt thoſe that ſo perfidiouſly had oppos'd it; it may not be ungrateful to the Reader to take Notice of *Richerius*'s Obſervations on his Brother Sorboniſt. *Con. Gen. Hiſt. l.* 4. *Par.* 2. *p.* 100, *& ſeq.*

1. The Reſervation of the Pope's Authority in thoſe Decrees which relate to the Reformation of Manners and Diſcipline, and his arbitrary diſpenſing with Canons, inſtead of advancing the Pontificate, leſſen its natural Force; and their uneaſy Care, and ſollicitous negotiating the Affair, betray the Juſtice of it. For in Three General Councils, *viz. Piſa*, *Conſtance*, and *Baſil*, it was carried againſt the Pope's having Power above a Council; and therefore, conſequently, he cannot diſpence with any Thing enacted in Council without the Advice and Conſent of the Council.

2. The Declaration of Pope *Paul* III. which *Eſpenſæus* takes Notice of, directly contradicts the Inſtitute of the Council of Nine, (*vid. ſupra, ad An.* 1534.) which was drawn up and publiſh'd by this Pope's Command. From whence *Eſpenſæus* obſerves, that the Reformation either of the Church or Court of *Rome* was utterly deſpaired of.

3. Inſtead of the Bleſſed Effects of Reformation, the miſerable Conſequences of the Want of it appeared in too many ſhameful Inſtances; particularly thoſe ſcandalous Diſpenſations for Pluraliſts, ſome of whom held, beſides the Cardinalſhip, Six Biſhopricks, and as many Abbies; others no leſs than Three Archbiſhopricks, and Six Abbies; and when they have been oblig'd to renounce ſome of their Promotions, they have not left ſufficient behind them to ſupport the Charge of the Cure. Nay this Reſervation of Power in the Pope, and diſpenſing with poſitive Canons, was ſo ignominiouſly

niouſly proſtituted to Pride and Avarice, that a certain Cardinal at his Death reſerv'd Six Abbies and one Archbiſhoprick for his Nephew of Three Years old. Theſe are egregious Monuments of the Church's reforming, after the Methods of the Council of *Trent*; and which are very oppoſite to the Articles of the Novemvirate, or Council of Nine. But to add to the Heap of Corruptions, ſeveral Noblemen and wealthy Perſons obtained Diſpenſations from the Court of *Rome* to hold ſeveral Benefices at one Time, without doing any Thing for them: And among others, Cardinals, by Vertue of a Privilege called *OS APERTUM*, never want a Diſpenſation to enjoy at one Time any Benefices, however incompatible. Which Sort of Privilege only thoſe Cardinals can have, who in Perſon have received their Hat from the Pope's Hand, from whoſe Hand likewiſe they take a ſecret Oath to maintain the Rights of the Court of *Rome*; for then, and not before, *Cardinalibus Os aperitur*, the Cardinal's Mouth is open'd; that is, he has Liberty, upon the Vacancy of the Holy See, to enter the Conclave in order to chooſe a new Pope; which Privilege no other Cardinal is allow'd. Theſe are the ſubtil Methods by which the Court of *Rome* obliges Men to their Intereſt.

4. In an Edition of the Acts of the Council of *Trent*, printed at *Antwerp*, *A. D.* 1564, which was the Year after the Council ended, it appears, that Cardinal *de Monte*, one of Pope *Paul* III.'s Legates at this Council, grievouſly complains of innumerable Grievances crept into the Adminiſtration of the Sacraments; which he, whilſt Legate, and one of the Preſidents of the Council, and afterwards Pope, by the Name of *Julius* III. was ſo far from reforming, that all Things go on in their old Road, ſo that Corruptions before complain'd of, and which

were

were the real Cauſe of the World's deſiring a General Council, inſtead of being amended, do here receive a Confirmation; and the Uſurpations of the Court of *Rome* receive an ample Sanction.

5. The frequent Prorogation of the Council of *Trent* is very remarkable: No Council before being retarded by ſo many Difficulties, Ceremonies, Artifices, *&c.* Whilſt the Church preſerv'd its Rights, and the Ariſtocratical Government flouriſh'd, Councils were clog'd with no Delays, but enjoy'd their proper Freedom in a due Celebration. But when once the abſolute Monarchy prevail'd, all ancient Rights are ſubdu'd to its Arbitrary Sway, Chriſtian Charity is extinguiſh'd, Reformation of Abuſes ſuppreſs'd, and all Things ſubmit to the inſatiate Deſire of Power. Upon this Foot of Power *Julius* III. prorogues this Council for two Years, notwithſtanding the earneſt Inſtances of the *Spaniſh* Biſhops, Twelve of which proteſt in Form againſt the Decree of Suſpenſion of the Council. *Dat. April* 28. *A. D.* 1552. This Proteſt of the *Spaniſh* Biſhops is expung'd out of the *Roman* Edition of the Council of *Trent*, and *Labbe* and *Coſſart* take no Notice of it; however it is to be found in the foreſaid Edition of the Council of *Trent*, printed at *Antwerp*, *A. D.* 1564. Notwithſtanding the Corruption and Prevarication which prevailed ſo in this Council; yet, by this Proteſt, we ſee there were ſome who retained, or at leſt wiſh'd well to the ancient Orthodox Government of the Church, and were ſtill for the Right of a Council's Power above that of a Pope. And certainly, till this Authority of Councils, and the Ariſtocratical Government of the Epiſcopate be reviv'd, there can be no Hope of recovering the true Diſcipline of the Church; but the Court of *Rome* will with its Arts prevail to ſuppreſs all Manner of Reformation.

6. All the Care of reforming the Church, and the Power of diſpenſing with the Canons, being left entirely to the Pope by the Council of *Trent*, all Hope of Emendation both in Church and Members were utterly laid aſide. For which *Eſpenſæus* aſſigns this Reaſon: Admit the Pope to have a mix'd Power at *Rome*, that is partly Temporal, partly Spiritual, ſo that none could hinder him from reforming his own Dioceſs and Court; yet he would find it next to an Impoſſibility to do it; for at *Rome* all Manner of Licentiouſneſs and Wickedneſs is practis'd more impudently and barefacedly, and that with Impunity too, than any where elſe: So that without an entire Change, there can be no Reformation expected at *Rome*. The State of the Church being thus degenerate, inſtead of Amendment, after the Council of *Trent*, all Things grew worſe: For that which was formerly a Tranſgreſſion by Connivance, is now become a Practice confirm'd by the diſpenſing Power of the *Roman* Pontiff, as he ſhall think fit.

But to come to the Concluſion of this Council of *Trent*: In *Hervetus*'s *French* Edition of the Council of *Trent*, and in the *Antwerp* Edition of it already mentioned, Cardinal *Morone*, the Pope's Legate, juſt before the Acclamations of the Biſhops, concludes the Council in theſe Words: *Placuit omnibus Patribus huic ſacro Concilio Finem imponi, Confirmationemque a SS. Domino noſtro peti,* TRIBUS DUNTAXAT EXCEPTIS, QUI CONFIRMATIONEM SE NON PETERE DIXERUNT. *Ideoque nos Apoſtolicæ Sedis Legati, & Præſidentes, eidem ſacro Concilio Finem imponimus, &c.* The Meaning is, there were Three Biſhops, who in the Concluſion of this Council would not conſent to have the Pope's Confirmation of it ask'd. Theſe, according to the foreſaid Editions of the Council of *Trent*, are Cardinal

Mo-

Morone's own Words; after which immediately follow the *Acclamations*, *Beatiſſimo Pio Papæ, &c. Long live Pope* Pius, *&c.* But the *Roman* Edition of this Council publiſh'd by *Manutius*, *A. D.* 1564. and *Labbè* and *Coſſart*, *Con. T.* 14. *p.* 919, 920, 921, leave out *TRIBUS EXCEPTIS*, *&c.* and inſtead of them ſay only, *Depart in Peace*, and then ſubjoin the Acclamations aforeſaid. Hence it is plain what we are to expect from the Court of *Rome*, who expunge and ſuppreſs every Thing that oppoſes their uſurp'd Rights. As for theſe Three Biſhops who refuſed the Pope's Confirmation of this Council, they ſeem'd to retain ſomething of the Primitive Temper in theſe Times of Latitude; for the Pope's Confirmation of the Acts of the ancient Councils was not deſir'd, but within his own Diſtrict. It being certain that Chriſt, in *Mat.* 16. promis'd his Preſence not to one ſingle Perſon alone, but to the Communion of Saints; and the Words, *Where Two or Three are gather'd together in my Name, I am there in the Midſt of them*, exclude all Singularity.

28 SE60

F I N I S.

THE INDEX.



Abbot of Abbots, 283
Abdication ill applied, 427
Abelard *the Heretick*, 317, 318. *Appeals to the Bishop of* Rome, 319
Abstinence forbid on Sundays, 123
Acacius, C. P. *persecuted by the Pope*, 71
Adrian I. *Pope*, 105
Adrian II. 150
Adrian III. 172
Adrian IV. *an* Englishman, 327
Adrian VI. 562
African *Bishops disown the Pope's Supremacy*, 55, 56
Assert their Rights, 64
Agapetus I. *Pope*, 84
Agapetus II. 189
Alcuin, 106
Alexander I. *Pope*, 11
Alexander II. 230
Alexander III. 333
Alexander IV. 405
Alexanner V. 467
Alexander VI. 512
Allegiance from Subjects to Kings conditional, 351
Ambrose, 53
Anaclete *Pope*, 9

Ana-

INDEX.

Anaſtaſius I. *Pope*, Page 55
Anaſtaſius II. 76
Anaſtaſius III. 185
Anaſtaſius IV. 327
Anicetus *Pope*, 14
Anterus *Pope*, 18
Antioch, *Council there*, 5
Appeals to Rome, 19, 27, 28. *Not allow'd*, 303
Arnold *of* Breſcia, *a notorious Heretick, favour'd by* Celeſtine II. *and the College of Cardinals*, 317
Arnoldiſts *extinguiſh'd*, 328
Athanaſius *abus'd by* Baronius, 40. *Clear'd*, 41. *Gave Laws to the whole World*, 47
Aurelius *Biſhop of* Carthage, 54

B.

Baptiſm by Lay-Hands allow'd by the Papiſts, 121, 122, 423, 425, 432, 457.
Baſil, *Council there*, 480
Bell, the ridiculous Superſtition of it, 445
Benedict I. *Pope*, 90
Benedict III. 134
Benedict V. 192
Benedict VIII. 207
Benedict IX. 213, 436
Benedict X. 229
Benedict XII. 450, 478
Benedict XIII. 462
Berengarian *Hereſy*, 205, 214
Biſhops, ſeveral preſide at once in the ſame Council, 48. *Made when not Prieſts*, 167. *Conſecrated to no See*, 172. *Created in Infancy*, 186. *Biſhops of* Rome *under Age*, 189, 213
Blunders in Forgeries, 242
Bohemia *had no Kings, only Dukes till Pope* Alexander III. 335

Boniface I. *Pope*, Page 63
Boniface II. 82
Boniface IV. 93
Boniface VI. 177
Boniface VIII. 428. *His Character*, 431
Boniface IX. 461
Boſtra, *Council there*, 19
Bulgarian *Hereſy*, 359

C.

CAjetan Thomas's *Oration at the* Lateran *Council*, 540
Caliſtus I. *Pope*, 16
Caliſtus II. 284
Caliſtus III. 505
Cecilia's *Body found*, 126
Celeſtine II. *Pope*, 317. *A Favourer of Hereticks*, ib.
Celeſtine IV. 399
Celeſtine V. 427
Celibacy, unjuſtly prov'd, 58, 59. *Aſſerted from a Forgery*, 420
Chalcedon. *The Reſolution of the Biſhops there againſt* Rome, 69
Children dying unbaptis'd damn'd, 60
Chorepiſcopi, 51. *When aboliſh'd*, 89
Chriſtopher *Pope*, 182
Clement's *Epiſtles Forgeries*, 6, &c.
Clement II. *Pope*, 222
Clement IV. 412
Clement V. 437
Clement VI. 451
Clement VII. 460
Clement VIII. 477
Commandments. The Second left out, and the Tenth divided, 108, 109, 457
Communion in both Kinds, 68, 73, 92

Con-

Confeſſion to the Virgin Mary, *St.* Michael, *and other Saints,* Page 446
Confirmation falſly proved a Sacrament, 17, 30
Conſtance, *Council there,* 469
Conſtantinople, *her Biſhops allow'd equal Honour with* Rome, 70. John, *Biſhop of it, claim'd the Title of Univerſal Biſhop,* 90
Cornelius *Pope,* 19
Corporale, *or Altar-Cloth, condemn'd,* 207
Council of Carthage *decrees againſt great Abuſes, the Pope not aſſiſting,* 58
Councils unfairly cited, 55, 56. *Ought to be called by the Pope falſly proved,* 28. *Perverted to ſerve a Turn,* 32. *Not called by the Pope,* 24, 46, 48, 49, 115, 119, 130, 135, 136, 173, 176, 183, 187. *Not confirm'd, but approv'd by the Biſhops of* Rome, 20. *Power of calling a General Council,* 269, 270. *Above a Pope,* 481
Councils left out by the Editors, 312

D.

DAmaſus I. *Pope,* 51
Damaſus II. 222
Decretal Epiſtles, 4. *Preferr'd to the Firſt Four General Councils, but proved by Forgeries,* 240, 242
Depoſing Doctrine 403
Deuſdedit *Pope,* 93
Dignities holding of the Pope, 368, 369
Dionyſius *Pope,* 23
Dionyſius *of* Alexandria *not cited to* Rome, Ibid.
Diſcipline, how ſubverted, 269
Diſpenſations, 446
Double Capacity, from whence taken, 282

INDEX.

E.

Eating up the Sins of the People, Page 12
Elvire, *the Editors differ about the Council there,* 28
Emperor, that Title falsly claim'd to be the Gift of the Bishop of Rome, 174
Ephesus. Concilium Latrocinale *held there,* 69
Epistles. Difference between true and forg'd, 64
Euaristus *Pope,* 11
Eugene II. *Pope,* 127
Eugene III. 321
Eugene IV. 479
Eusebius *Pope,* 29
Eusebius *falsly said to be Bishop of* Alexandria, 18
Eutyches, 68
Eutychianus *Pope,* 25

F.

Fabian *Pope,* 18
Felix I. *Pope,* 24, 49
Felix II. 72
Felix III. 81
Felix V. 484
Fire and Faggot Propagation, its Beginning, 359
Firmilianus *Bishop of* Cesarea *slights the Bishop of* Rome, 24
Formosus *Pope,* 174, 178, 180
France *like to lose the Title of Most Christian,* 544
Frankford, *Council there condemn'd Image-Worship,* 107
Another Council there condemns several Incroachments of the Church of Rome, 207, 208

INDEX.

G.

GAius *Pope*, Page 25
Gallican *Church, her Rights*, 257, 258
Gelasius I. *Pope*, 72
Gelasius II. 284
German *Empire, the Two Causes of its Ruine*, 386
Greek *Church owned no Subjection to the* Latin *Church*, 367. *Subdu'd to it*, 368
Gregory the Great, *Pope*, 90
Gregory II. 100
Gregory III. 103
Gregory IV. 129
Gregory V. 193
Gregory VI. 218. *The Difference between him and* Gregory Nazianzen, 221. *His Character*, 239
Gregory IX. 386. *His treacherous Design to betray the Emperor to the Soldan of the* Saracens, 387
Gregory X. 414
Gregory XI. 458
Gregory XII. 465

H.

HEnry I. *King of* England *espouses the Interest of the See of* Canterbury *against the Pope*, 289. *The Pope's Perfidy in this Case*, 290
Hereticks not always abjure their Heresies at Rome, 41, 42
Hilarius *Pope*, 71
Hincmar *Bishop of* Rhemes, 144, 148. *Pope* John's *Epistle to him*, 156
Holy Land, the modern Use and base Ends of Expeditions to it, 381
Honorius I. *Pope*, 94. *Condemned of Heresy*, 95

Ho-

Honorius II. 293. *His Election queſtioned, and reſigning is re-elected,* Page 294
Honorius III. 381. *His Deſign upon all Eccleſiaſtick Dignities check'd by* Henry III. *King of* England, 383
Honorius IV. 425
Hormiſdas *Pope,* 74
Hoſt. The Adoration of it, 425. *Elevation of it,* 433. Henry *the Emperor poiſon'd with a Hoſt,* 438
Huſs John, 476

J.

JAmes (*St.*) *died before St.* Peter.] 7
Idolatry, 422
Jerome *of* Prague, 476
Image-Worſhip, 5. *Falſly proved,* 29. *Condemn'd,* 105, 112, 122, &c. *Controverted,* 107. *Confirm'd,* 120. *The Cauſe of the Quarrel between Pope* Nicolas I. *and* Photius, 14
Images, the nice Diſtinction of Worſhipping them, 91. *Their pretended Original and Uſe,* 100. *Removed out of Churches,* 101
Indulgences of Rome *condemn'd,* 208. *For thoſe that went to the Holy Land,* 291. *Inforc'd,* 45
Infallibility ſhock'd by Pope Paſchal II. 275. *And by Pope* Nicolas V. 449. *And by Pope* Eugene IV. 482
Innocent I. *Pope,* 58
Innocent II. 295
Innocent III. 355
Innocent IV. 400
Innocent VI. 453
Innocent VIII. 512
Inquiſition, 378. *Confirm'd in the Council of* Toloufe *by Pope* Gregory IX.*'s Mandate,* 393, 394. *The Unreaſonableneſs of it,* 396. *Inforc'd,* 405

INDEX.

Inveſtitures raviſh'd from the Regale, Page 238, 242.
Allow'd to the Regale, 274. *Cancell'd*, 288
Invocation of Saints falſly proved, 19
John I. *Pope*, 80
John II. 84
John III. 89
John IV. 95
John V. 99
John VIII. 155
John IX. 180
John X. 185
John XI. 188
John XII. 189
John XIX. *His Simonical Entrance on the Papacy*, 209
John XXI. 421
John XXII. 447
John XXIII. 469
Iſidor Mercator, 2
Julius *Pope*, 38. *Charge againſt him*, 529
Julius II. 516
Julius III. 566
Jubilee firſt Inſtituted, 430
Another Inſtituted, 451

K.

Kiſſing the Pope's Toe, its Original, 113
Kiſſing his Feet, 134

L.

Lambeſe, *Council there*, 19
Lando *Pope*, 185
Laurentius Anglicus, *a Defender of* William *St.* Amore, 409

Lay-

Lay-Baptism inforc'd, Page 410
Leo I. *Pope*, 67. *His Design on the Council of* Chalcedon, 69
Leo II. 96
Leo III. 113
Leo IV. 132
Leo V. 181
Leo VI. 188
Leo IX. 223
Leo X. 545
Leo Bituricensis *mistaken for Pope* Leo I. 71
Lewis IX. *King of* France, 487
Lewis XII. *King of* France, 522
Liberius *Pope*, 43. *A Heretick*, 47
Linus, 10
Lucius *King, his Epistle to Pope* Eleutherius, 15
Lucius I. *Pope* 20
Lucius II. 320
Lucius III. 349
Luther, 561

M.

Magick, Ecclesiasticks famous for it, 231
Manichees, 68
Marcellinus *Pope, an unlucky Instance of the Infallibility*, 26
Marcellus *Pope, very obscure*, 27
Mark *Pope*, 35
Married Clergy ill treated by Pope Gregory VII. 234, &c.
Martin I. *Pope*, 96
Martin II. 170
Martin IV. 422
Martin V. 475
Martyrology, 16

Mass for the Dead falsly proved from St. Cyprian, Page 24, 25
Melchiades *Pope*, 30
Mendicants Exempts, 445
Monks subject to their Diocesan, 123
Monotheletick *Heresy*, 95

N.

NIcene *Council named before it sat*, 31. *By whom called*, 32, 33. *Who presided in it*, 33, 34, 35. *It's Canons sent by Pope* Mark *to* Athanasius, *a Sham*, 35. *Number of its Canons*, ib. *For what End the Eighty Canons were palm'd upon it*, 35, 36. *Uncertain in what Pontificate it was called*, 36
Nicolas I. *Pope*, 139
Nicolas II. 229
Nicolas III. 421
Nicolas IV. 426
Nicolas V. *a great Encourager of Learning*, 503, 504
Nocere Fratres *a Blunder*, 16
Novatus, 18

O.

OCtavian *the first Pope that changed his Name*, 191

P.

PAll, *the Use of it*, 61. *Its fabulous Original*, 370
Paschal I. *Pope*, 124. *Begs the Emperor's Pardon for taking the Pontificate without his Knowledge*, 125
Paschal II. 266. *His prevaricating with the Sacrament*, 277
Paschal Wax-Taper, 61

INDEX.

Patriarch of Antioch *arbitrarily depos'd by the Pope's Legate*, Page 310
Paul I. *Pope*, 104
Paul II. 563
Paul III. Ibid.
Pelagius I. *Pope, accuſed of Murder*, 88
Pelagius II. 90
Peter *(St.) did not name* Linus, Cletus *aud* Clement, *his Succeſſors*, 3. *The Fable of his being Porter of Heaven*, 17
Photius *Patriarch of* Conſtantinople, *his Character*, 159
Piſa, *the Council there*, 465. *Another*, 522
Pius I. *Pope*, 14
Pius II. 505
Platina, *patroniz'd by Pope* Sixtus IV. 510
Pontianus, *Pope*, 17
Pontificalis Liber, 2
Popes, the firſt that changed his Name, 191. *May depoſe Kings*, 92. *Joined in Commiſſion with other Biſhops*, 31. Cabbaſute's *groſs Miſtake about the Election of a Pope*, 416, &c. *Appoint their Succeſſors*, 247, 254, 266. *Trampling on the Necks of Kings*, 341. *Their pretended Power of making Kings*, &c. 259. *Kick the Crown off their Heads*, 354. *Their Temporal Power falſely maintain'd*, 450. *How their Power decay'd*, 452. *Judg'd by Councils, and depos'd*, 465, 468, 474, 483, &c.
Pragmatick Sanction, 486, &c. *When pretended to be recall'd*, 490, &c.
Privatus, *the Heretick*, 19
Purgatory, the Doctrine forbid, 131

R.

Rebaptization of Hereticks, in Oppoſition to the Biſhop of Rome, 22
Rebellion allow'd, 236

Refor-

Reformation, the Occaſion of it, Page 263
Regale *encroach'd on by the Pontificate,* 233, 234
Regulars, ſubject to their Biſhops, 123, 131, 137, 167. *Independent of Biſhops,* 263, 379. *The Unreaſonableneſs of this,* Ibid.
Relicks, 115. *A new Sort of them,* 433
Rome, *her Church and Court different,* 534. *Her Biſhops cannot err; and St.* Peter's *Succeſſors in the Eccleſiaſtick Monarchy falſely prov'd,* 20, 21. *No Superiority allow'd to her by the* African *Biſhops,* 21, 22. *Charg'd with Simony, Hereſy,* &c. 435. *Doctrines of the Church of* Rome *made an Article of Salvation,* 441. *Council at* Rome *counterfeited,* 39. *Her Biſhops judged in Council,* 115, 236. *Choſen by Appointment of the Emperor,* 230. *Their Encroachments on the Eaſtern Patriarchs,* 142. *See of* Rome *tranſlated to* France *by Pope* Clement V. 437. *Reſtor'd by* Gregory XI. 458. *It's Sovereignty firſt aſſum'd by Pope* Boniface IX. 461

S.

SAbinian, *Pope,* 93
Sacrament in both Kinds profanely forbid and juſtified, 477
Sacraments prov'd by forg'd Citations, 58
Sacramental Controverſy, or Berengarian Hereſy's Original, 205
Sardis, *Council,* 40. *By whom call'd,* 41
Saturday-Faſt, 29
School-Divinity eſtabliſh'd, 356
Scotland, *its Church ſubject to the Primacy of* York, 353
Scripture-Texts forg'd, 59. *Uſe of the Holy Scripture in the vulgar Tongue forbid,* 356, 392
Sergius II. *Pope,* 132
Sergius III. 182

Sergius IV. Page 206
Simony, much practis'd in Pope Leo III.*'s Time*, 124.
Charg'd on Gregory VII. 232
Simplicius, *Pope*, 71
Sinueſſa, *a Sham-Council there*, 26
Siricius, *Pope*, 52, 53
Sixtus II. *Pope, miſtaken for* Sixtus *the Philoſopher by the Pontifical*, 23
Sixtus III. *Pope*, 66
Sixtus IV. 510
Sorboniſts Diſpute with the Fryars Mendicants, 406
Soter, *Pope*, 15
Spellman *unjuſtly reprov'd by* Coſſart, 414
Stephen, *Pope, very turbulent to the* Africans, 21
Stephen V. *Pope*, 173
Stephen VI. 177
Stephen IX. 227
Stews licens'd in Rome *by Pope* Sixtus IV. 510
Subjection in Temporals demanded by the Pope from Philip the Fair, 436
Superſtition, a ridiculous One, 434
Supremacy, unjuſtly founded and maintained, 25, 27. *Inſiſted on*, 13, 15, 16, 30. *When not known*, 32, 39. *Maintained and unjuſtly defended*, 38, 173. *Queſtion'd*, 40. *Controverted*, 54. *Not allow'd Biſhops of* Rome, 130, 133. *Claim'd by* Gregory VII. 236. *Contradicted by a Forgery*, 302. *Weakly prov'd by Pope* Gregory IX. *from Scripture*, 390, 391. *Confuted*, 419
Swords Two, of the Church, 430
Sylverius, *Pope*, 86
Sylveſter II. *Pope*, 198
Symmachus, *Pope*, 78

28 SE60

INDEX.

T.

TEleſphorus, *Pope.* Page 13
Templers Knights, their Order extinguiſh'd, 440, &c. *The unjuſt Proceſs againſt them,* 444. *Decreed to be reſtor'd,* Ibid.
Thaddæus, *the Advocate of the Emperor* Frideric, 403
Theodore, *Pope,* 95
Thurſtan, *Archbiſhop of* York, 272
Transferring Crowns unjuſtly claim'd by the Biſhops of Rome, 114
Tranſlating Biſhops falſly aſſumed by the Biſhop of Rome, 16
Tranſlation of Relicks, 19
Tranſubſtantiation condemned by Pope Gelaſius, 75. *Made an Article of Faith,* 364
Trent, *Council there,* 565
Trinity, the Word not uſed till after the Second Century, 12

V.

VAlentine, *Pope,* 129
Victor III. *Pope,* 247
Vigilius, *Pope,* 87
Virgin Mary, *a ridiculous Superſtition concerning her,* 434, 435
Vitalianus, *Pope,* 96. *Excommunicated by* Maurice *Biſhop of* Ravenna, Ibid.
Viterbo, *his fine Oration at the Lateran Council,* 539
Urban II. *Pope,* 254. *The firſt that granted Indulgences to thoſe who went to the Holy War,* 291, 292
Urban III. *Pope,* 352
Urban IV. 411. *His neat Apology for his mean Extraction,* 412
Urban V. *Pope,* 456

Urban VI. *Pope*, Page 459
Urſicinus, *Competitor for the Papacy*, 51, 53

W.

Water mix'd with Salt, 12
Wax-Candles in the Day-Time, 29
Wickleff, 454, *&c.*
William de St. Amore, *a ſtrenuous Oppoſer of the Friars Preachers*, 407, 408, *&c.*

X.

Xiſtus, *Pope*, 13

Z.

Zephirine, *Pope*, 16
Zoſimus, *Pope*, 61

ERRATA.

PAge 62. Line 21. *for* Eight, *read* Right; p. 78. l. 26. *for* Sy, *r.* Synod; p. 109. l. 18. *for* and other, *r.* the other; p. 158. l. 5. *for* puts, *r.* put; p. 201. l. 29. *for* endar'd, *r.* endear'd; p. 203. l. 10. *for* of, *r.* on; p. 245. l. 16. *dele* he; p. 253. l. 35. *for* Proof, *r.* Proofs; p. 254. l. 20. *dele* of; p. ib. l. 33. *for* Council in, *r.* of; p. 264. l. 25. *for* the, *r.* your; p. 267. l. 5. *for* Chiny, *r.* Cluny; p. 276. *for* m, *r.* me; p. 284. l. 37. *in* Eccleſiaſticks, *dele* s; p. 303. l. 5. *for* agrees, *r.* agree; p. 310. l. 2. *for* the to, *r.* to the; p. 322. l. 24. *for* alive, *r.* alike; p. 324. l. 15. *for* leſs, *r.* loſt; p. 352. l. 3. *for* Urban II. *r.* Urban III. p. 374. l. 30. *for* Peleuſiora, *r.* Peleuſiota; p. 381. l. 31. *dele* or; p. 392. l. 17. *for* χέφαλη, *r.* κεφαλὴ; p. 447. l. 1. *for* beſt, *r.* laſt; p. 458. l. 29. *for* Gregory IX. *r.* XI. *and* l. 34. *for* IX. *r.* XI. p. 474. l. 30. *for* Seſſion, *r.* Ceſſion; p. 481. l. 35. *for* delared, *r.* declared; p. 483. l. 19. *in* Braſil, *dele* r; p. 496. l. 21. *for* Peace, *r.* Plague.

8466.c.7